



CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT TO WEEKLY REPORT No. 38, SEPT. 18, 1959

CONGRESS - 1959

A Legislative Review of the 86th Congress - 1st Session

(Including Key Votes of All Members)

Table of Contents

SUMMARY OF THE SESSION	1	NATIONAL SECURITY	15
FISCAL POLICY	2	Defense Debate, Military Budget, Draft Extension, Radiation Hazards	
Highway Finances, Tax Measures, Appropriations, Debt Management, TVA Revenue Bonds, Inflation		FEDERAL REGULATION	18
CIVIL BENEFITS	6	Labor Reform, Civil Rights, Court Bills, Antitrust	
Housing, Education, Health, Aid to Airports, Area Redevelopment, Vet- erans' Pensions, Labor Aids, Farm Measures, Natural Resources		GENERAL GOVERNMENT	22
FOREIGN POLICY	12	Hawaii, Federal-State Relations, Nominations, President vs. Congress, Senate Rules	
Mutual Security, International Develop- ments, Foreign Investment		KEY VOTES in House, Senate	24-32
		Boxscore—p. ii; Index—p. iii; Around the Capitol in 1959—p. iv	

COPYRIGHT 1959

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • STerling 3-8060

Congressional Boxscore

MAJOR LEGISLATION IN 86th CONGRESS

As of Sept. 18, 1959

Party Lineups

	Dem.	GOP	Vacancies
SENATE	65	35	0
HOUSE	283	153	1

BILL	HOUSE		SENATE		STATUS
First Housing Bill (S 57)	Reported 2/27/59	Passed 5/21/59	Reported 2/4/59	Passed 2/5/59	Vetoed 7/7/59
Second Housing Bill (S 2539)	Reported 8/25/59	Passed 8/27/59	Reported 8/13/59	Passed 8/18/59	Vetoed 9/3/59
Third Housing Bill (S 2654)	Committee By-passed	Passed 9/10/59	Reported 9/8/59	Passed 9/9/59	To President
Hawaii Statehood (S 50)	Reported 2/12/59	Passed 3/12/59	Reported 3/5/59	Passed 3/11/59	P. L. 86-3 3/18/59
Federal Education Aid (S 8) (HR 22)	Reported 6/8/59		Approved 9/8/59		
Labor Reform (S 1555)	Reported 7/30/59	Passed 8/14/59	Reported 4/14/59	Passed 4/25/59	P. L. 86-257 9/14/59
Airport Construction (S 1)	Reported 3/2/59	Passed 3/19/59	Reported 2/5/59	Passed 2/6/59	P. L. 86-72 6/29/59
Depressed Areas (S 722)	Reported 5/14/59		Reported 3/18/59	Passed 3/24/59	
REA Loan Authority (S 144)	Reported 3/20/59	Passed 4/15/59	Reported 3/24/59	Passed 4/8/59	Vetoed 4/27/59
Supreme Court Powers (S 3) (HR 3)	Reported 6/2/59	Passed 6/24/59	Hearings Completed		
Civil Rights (S 2391) (HR 8601)	Reported 8/20/59		Hearings Completed		
Draft Extension (HR 2260)	Reported 2/2/59	Passed 2/5/59	Reported 3/9/59	Passed 3/11/59	P. L. 86-4 3/23/59
Wheat Program (S 1968)	Reported 5/25/59	Passed 6/12/59	Reported 5/18/59	Passed 5/22/59	Vetoed 6/25/59
Mutual Security Funds (HR 8385)	Reported 7/24/59	Passed 7/29/59	Reported 9/8/59	Passed 9/14/59	To President
Mutual Security Program (HR 7500)	Reported 6/5/59	Passed 6/18/59	Reported 6/22/59	Passed 7/8/59	P. L. 86-108 7/24/59
World Bank, Monetary Fund (S 1094)	Reported 3/18/59	Passed 3/25/59	Reported 3/18/59	Passed 3/19/59	P. L. 86-48 6/17/59
Life Insurance Taxes (HR 4245)	Reported 2/13/59	Passed 2/18/59	Reported 5/14/59	Passed 5/19/59	P. L. 86-69 6/25/59
Bond Interest Rates (HR 9035)	Rejected 8/18/59	Passed 9/4/59	Reported 9/7/59	Passed 9/8/59	To President
Debt Limit Increase (HR 7749)	Reported 6/16/59	Passed 6/18/59	Reported 6/25/59	Passed 6/25/59	P. L. 86-74 6/30/59
Corporate, Excise Taxes (HR 7523)	Reported 6/4/59	Passed 6/8/59	Reported 6/24/59	Passed 6/25/59	P. L. 86-75 6/30/59
Postal Rate Increase (S 1923)					
Highway Financing (HR 8678)	Reported 9/1/59	Passed 9/3/59	Reported 9/4/59	Passed 9/5/59	To President
TVA Revenue Bonds (HR 3460)	Reported 4/14/59	Passed 5/7/59	Reported 7/2/59	Passed 7/9/59	P. L. 86-137 8/6/59
Farm Surplus Disposal (HR 8609)	Reported 8/15/59	Passed 8/20/59	Reported 7/15/59	Passed 9/7/59	To President

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

A service for editors and standard reference on U.S. Congress

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: David S. Broder, Mary W. Cohn, William A. Korns, Helene C. Monberg, Spencer A. Rich, John E. Skuce, George C. Wilson.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatmuck, Ruth Hussey, Jerry Jarvis, Eleanor King, Gladys Miller, Shirley Seib, Edward T. Walsh.

C.Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rothbun.

Editorial Assistants: Judy Kazan, Jonas V. Morris, Roberta Russell, Wayne Walker.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin Jr.

This Supplement
prepared by:
William A. Korns

Copyright 1959 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

Congress - 1959

Partisan Debate Over Spending Reduced Major Achievements to Two: Hawaii and Labor Reform

After the longest session since 1951, the 86th Congress adjourned at 6:22 a.m. on Sept. 15, 1959 with two major accomplishments to its credit -- an act admitting Hawaii to statehood, and a "tough" labor reform law embodying the first major changes in the Taft-Hartley Act since it was enacted in 1947.

For the rest, the session was distinguished by one remarkable fact. Despite their 2-to-1 majorities in the Senate and the House, Democrats made only token progress toward achieving their legislative objectives. Conversely, however, they granted only 40 percent of President Eisenhower's requests.

As the 1959 session opened Jan. 7, there was no question that a partisan battle of panoramic scope was in store. The Democratic majority, reinforced and refreshed by the mid-term elections of 1958, seemed bent on stepping up the pace of a wide range of domestic programs. And the President was just as clearly determined to insist on holding the line wherever possible.

What was not then apparent -- but rapidly became so -- was that in the "spending" issue the President had found a two-edged sword of phenomenal strength. Not only did it serve to galvanize the Republican minority and to invigorate the GOP-Southern Democratic coalition, enabling the President to make all but one of his vetoes stick. Equally important, it put Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker Sam Rayburn on the defensive, leaving their more zealous cohorts with a weakened command.

In the end, it was the President's view that prevailed more often than not on legislation processed through to enactment. Many issues, however, were left in abeyance until 1960, when the pressures of a Presidential election year promised to produce an even more partisan session than that of 1959. Following are the highlights of major legislative developments in the first session.

Fiscal Policy: To meet an impending crisis in highway finances, Congress agreed reluctantly to raise the gas tax from 3 to 4 cents per gallon. The legislators also agreed to postpone scheduled tax reductions and to add \$200 million a year to the life insurance industry's tax bill. TVA was given authority to issue revenue bonds, and the ceiling on the public debt was raised, to \$295 million. But Democrats, always prepared to do battle with the Eisenhower Administration over interest rates, refused to remove the limit on the Treasury's long-term bond rate.

Civil Benefits: The President vetoed two omnibus housing bills before Congress produced one he was willing to sign; the final measure represented a definite setback for both sides, however. Only limited action was taken on health and education programs;

neither the Democratic or Administration proposals to aid school construction made much headway. Democratic plans to enlarge aid programs for airports and sewage construction, and to inaugurate a massive area redevelopment program all came to naught. But a costly measure revising veterans' pensions made the grade. No new farm legislation emerged.

Foreign Affairs: Democrats lost their effort to put foreign development loans on a long-term basis; funds voted for the Mutual Security Program came to \$3.2 billion, or \$1.2 billion less than requested. Congress did agree, however, to increase U.S. subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, and to approve U.S. participation in the new Inter-American Development Bank.

National Security: After long debate over the "missile gap" and the general adequacy of the defense effort, Congress approved a defense budget just about as large as requested. The legislators also voted to extend the draft for another four years, and to provide another \$500 million for the space program.

Federal Regulation: Laboring under intense pressure from union and business lobbyists, Congress ended its two-year effort to curb labor corruption by writing a stringent reform law that also tightened restrictions on union organizing tactics. But the anticipated battle over a civil rights bill never came off; by general agreement, it was deferred until 1960.

General Government: By quick and decisive votes, Congress opened the door to statehood for Hawaii, in time for the new state's Congressional delegation to participate in the closing days of the session. By contrast, the Senate, after long and bitter debate, rejected the President's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Detailed accounts of these and other legislative actions during the first session of the 86th Congress appear on the following pages. See the front cover for a Table of Contents and the inside back cover for a detailed Index.

Fiscal Policy

Dispute Over Finances Dominated First Session

Heated and repeated conflict over fiscal policy dominated the first session of the 86th Congress. President Eisenhower's plans for achieving "fiscal integrity" and a balanced budget clashed head-on with Democratic plans for lifting the "intolerable burden of laggard government" (as Sen. Johnson put it on opening day). The battle raged right down to adjournment, with heavy losses in both camps.

The President's budget for fiscal 1960, transmitted to Congress Jan. 19, called for a precarious balance between estimated receipts of \$77.1 billion and expenditures of \$77 billion. Both projections were contingent on Democratic cooperation in raising revenues and cutting expenditures. Neither objective was fully achieved, but by dint of an extraordinary campaign against the "spenders" and "budget-busters," buttressed by a series of stinging vetoes, the Administration succeeded in blunting the Democratic drive to enlarge a host of Federal programs.

The final tally on appropriations showed a substantial reduction in budget requests (see box, next page). But the effect of these cuts on actual expenditures in fiscal 1960 would almost certainly be less than that of increases enacted in housing and health programs, coupled with the failure of Congress to raise postage rates by \$350 million as requested.

By adjournment, Budget Bureau officials were estimating that fiscal 1960 expenditures would be closer to \$79 billion, and that outlays in fiscal 1961 might reach \$81 billion. Whether revenues would rise sufficiently to keep the budget in balance depended, to a large extent, on the rate at which the economy continued to expand.

All in all, the "spending" debate of 1959 produced rather meagre results. The basic fiscal questions facing the nation, respecting the Federal role in the economy, remained unanswered.

Highway Finances

President Eisenhower's request for a 50 percent increase in the Federal excise tax on gasoline -- from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon -- set off the loudest and longest tax row of 1959. Democrats especially were incensed by the proposal because it was a key factor in enabling the President to draw a paper balance in his 1960 budget. State governments, with a big stake in their own gas taxes, also set up a howl. In the end, however, Congress bowed to necessity and approved a 1-cent increase, effective Oct. 1, 1959.

Back of the President's request was an incipient crisis in the Highway Trust Fund, created in 1956 to finance Federal grants to the states for building highways, including the projected 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System scheduled to be completed

in 1972. In 1958, Congress, as an anti-recession measure, suspended for two years the Trust Fund's pay-as-you-go provision, at a time when the Fund's receipts from the gas tax and other highway-user levies were falling off. As a result, a sizable deficit loomed in 1960 and following years. According to Federal Highway Administrator Bertram D. Tallamy, the short-fall would amount to \$13 billion by 1972 unless Trust Fund revenues were increased.

For months Congress ignored the President's request. On June 25 he again called for action, warning that otherwise the highway program would grind to a halt. "The only serious alternatives now being considered by the Congress -- waiving the Byrd 'pay-as-you-go' amendment or diversion of other taxes -- would solve nothing," he said. Either step, he added, would be "unacceptable to me."

Two House Committees with overlapping jurisdiction promptly became deadlocked over the issue. On July 29 the Ways and Means Committee voted 15-10 to stretch out the highway program for another six years, cut expenditures through 1968, and issue \$1 billion in bonds to offset the impending deficit. This proposal was rejected Aug. 6 by the Public Works Committee. On Aug. 13 Ways and Means reversed itself and voted 16-9 for a 1 cent increase in the gas tax until June 30, 1961 and the diversion of certain other taxes to the Trust Fund for three subsequent years. Again Public Works balked, then finally capitulated and reported a bill Sept. 1 embodying the Ways and Means formula.

The House passed HR 8678 Sept. 3, by a 243-162 vote. (See House Roll Call No. 11, p. 28.) The Senate, which in June had rejected attempts to attach either the President's proposal or an alternative formula to another bill (see below), then passed a slightly different version of HR 8678 on Sept. 5, by a 70-11 vote, after rejecting several efforts to amend the bill. The House accepted the Senate's changes Sept. 9 without debate. As sent to the President, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959 provided as follows:

- Raised the Federal tax on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels from 3 cents to 4 cents per gallon, for 21 months starting Oct. 1, 1959.

- Provided for diverting from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund, for three years beginning July 1, 1961, five percentage points of the 10 percent tax on new automobiles and of the 8 percent tax on auto parts.

- Decreased from \$2.5 billion to \$2 billion the fiscal 1961 authorization for the Interstate Highway System.

- Exempted portions of the System located within commercial or industrial areas of cities from the billboard-regulation provisions of the 1956 law.

The temporary boost in the gas tax was expected to yield about \$1 billion; another \$2.5 billion would accrue from the diverted auto taxes. Although the President had expressed opposition to the diversion plan, he was forced to accept the measure as the strongest that Congress was willing to provide.

Tax Measures

To help balance the 1960 budget, President Eisenhower, in addition to asking for an increase in the gas tax, called on Congress to take five other steps: postpone (for the sixth year in a row) a scheduled reduction in the corporate income and certain excise taxes, enact a new formula for taxing the income of life insurance companies, revise the rules for computing depletion allowances, write a new law for taxing cooperatives, and raise the tax on aviation gasoline to 4½ cents. Congress complied with the first two requests, took no action on the other three.

● **Tax Extension:** Faced with a revenue loss estimated at \$3.1 billion in fiscal 1960 if reductions in the 52-percent corporate income and certain excise tax rates were allowed to take effect on June 30, the President asked Congress to extend the rates without change for another year.

The House went along without fuss, passing the extension bill (HR 7523) June 8. But the Senate Finance Committee voted for immediate repeal of the 10 percent tax on passenger travel and for repeal of the tax on communications a year hence. In floor debate June 25, the Senate confirmed the first of these changes, by a 52-26 vote, and also agreed, by a 47-31 vote, to repeal the 4 percent tax credit allowed on income from dividends. Four other amendments aimed at closing tax "loopholes" were rejected, however. The Senate also turned down two proposals for dealing with the crisis in highway finances -- one to divert certain receipts from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund, by a 32-47 vote, and one to comply with the President's request to raise the gas tax, by a 33-46 vote. (See Senate Roll Call No. 13, p. 32.)

Congress Appropriated More Than \$82 Billion in 1959†

Agency	Requested	HOUSE		SENATE		Final
		Committee	Passed	Committee	Passed	
Agriculture	\$ 4,081,364,863	\$ 3,939,165,498	\$ 3,939,165,498	\$ 3,975,505,148	\$ 3,975,775,148	\$ 3,971,362,673
Commerce	732,191,000	674,687,300	675,297,300	715,328,500	715,328,500	712,672,900
Defense	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	38,848,339,000	39,594,339,000	39,594,339,000	39,228,239,000
District of Columbia						
Federal payment	34,218,000	27,218,000	27,218,000	29,218,000	29,351,000	27,218,000
District payment	(245,990,000)	(237,186,112)	(237,186,112)	(241,569,402)	(241,702,402)	(241,289,076)
Executive Offices	13,608,500	13,338,500	13,338,500	13,568,500	13,568,500	13,463,500
Independent Offices	6,584,188,000	6,438,839,800	6,457,657,800	6,559,348,600	6,559,348,600	6,502,152,200
Interior	487,675,400	468,106,800	468,106,800	478,785,025	478,785,025	472,717,100
Labor-HEW	3,691,685,581	3,915,084,181	3,915,084,181	4,056,746,581	4,056,746,581	3,950,938,981
Legislative	133,648,180	100,279,350	100,279,350	128,797,380	128,797,380	128,797,380
Public Works	1,176,677,000	1,176,579,834	1,176,579,834	1,176,579,834	1,176,579,834	1,176,579,834
State-Justice	677,301,100	649,896,700	651,896,700	645,418,200	645,668,200	643,934,700
Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	4,628,097,000	4,628,097,000	4,663,158,600	4,664,027,000	4,643,363,000
Mutual Security						
Mutual Security Program	4,429,995,000	3,186,500,000	3,186,500,000	3,281,813,000	3,281,813,000	3,225,813,000
Other Items*	394,489,137	23,282,000	5,282,000	385,790,000	410,449,137	400,905,137
Atomic Energy	2,687,300,000	2,629,114,000	2,629,114,000	2,680,414,000	2,680,414,000	2,651,614,000
Military Construction	1,563,200,000	1,285,002,700	1,285,002,700	1,428,178,700	1,428,178,700	1,363,961,200
2nd Supplemental 1959	2,900,799,370	2,479,522,494	2,657,402,994	2,820,040,054	2,843,902,805	2,764,500,380
1st Supplemental 1960	1,218,090,555	632,568,845	609,843,845	1,076,186,108	1,076,186,108	977,345,608
Special Funds**	9,275,166,000	9,275,166,000	9,275,166,000	9,275,166,000	9,275,166,000	9,275,166,000
TOTAL	\$84,018,124,686					\$82,130,744,593

* Requests for these miscellaneous funds were made after initial House action on the Mutual Security bill.

** Permanent indefinite appropriations for the Treasury Department of which \$8.5 billion was for interest on the national debt.

† Congress in 1959 also voted a total of \$2,981,922,222 in supplemental funds for fiscal 1959.

House conferees refused to go along with the Senate's changes in HR 7523. Their only concession was to agree to provisions repealing the 10 percent tax on local telephone service and cutting the tax on passenger travel from 10 to 5 percent, both effective July 1, 1960 -- by which time Congress would have had to act on the entire tax package once again. The House accepted the conference report June 29 without dissent; the Senate followed suit, by a 57-35 vote, with a majority of Democrats opposed. The President signed the bill June 30.

● **Life Insurance:** Tax experts in Congress and the Treasury began in 1958 to search for a permanent formula for taxing the profits of the life insurance industry, much of whose income from investments and other sources must be set aside in reserves to meet the contracts of policyholders. The President asked only that the new law produce about \$200 million more in revenue than the old law.

Under a complex bill (HR 4245) passed by the House Feb. 18 and by the Senate May 19 after extensive revision, a three-phase formula was established for taxing both a portion of net investment income and, for the first time, all so-called underwriting profits. As finally approved and sent to the President June 10, the bill was expected to yield revenues of about \$500 million on the industry's 1958 income and higher amounts in later years -- a substantial increase over amounts previously paid under various temporary formulas.

● **Interstate Taxation:** Another major tax problem was laid in Congress' lap when the Supreme Court, in separate rulings Feb. 24 and March 2, upheld the right of states to tax the income of out-of-state corporations on the basis of earnings within those states. After extended debate over the economic impact of the rulings and the propriety of Federal intervention, Congress Sept. 3 sent the President a stop-gap measure (S 2524) that --

● Prohibited a state from levying a tax on the net income of any business whose sole activity within the state was (1) the solicitation of orders for tangible personal property, to be approved and filled from outside the state, or (2) the solicitation of orders for a client or customer, if approved and filled from outside the state.

● Ordered the House Judiciary and Senate Finance Committees to study the problem of interstate taxation and recommend uniform standards, by July 1, 1962.

● **Self-Employed Retirement:** As in 1958, the House March 16 passed a bill (HR 10) to permit self-employed persons to defer payment of income tax on money put into retirement funds up to \$2,500 a year or a total of \$50,000. The Treasury opposed the measure, saying it would cost \$365 million a year, with 80 percent of the tax relief going to persons earning more than \$10,000 a year. The Senate Finance Committee, after holding hearings on the bill, took no further action before adjournment.

Debt Management

The \$12.5 billion deficit incurred by the Treasury in fiscal 1959 -- the result of increased spending and lowered receipts in the wake of the 1957-58 recession -- focused attention on the problems of managing the public debt, which by adjournment had passed the \$290-billion mark for the first time. Three aspects of the debt problem came before Congress.

● **Debt Ceiling:** For the third time in less than two years, President Eisenhower was obliged to ask the legislators to raise the legal limit on the public debt. In 1958 Congress had first raised it from \$275 billion to \$280 billion, then to \$283 billion with a temporary addition of \$5 billion to lapse on June 30, 1959. This proved sufficient to permit the Treasury to borrow enough funds to cover the fiscal 1959 deficit. But it was not sufficient to carry the Treasury through the first half of fiscal 1960 -- a period in the year when lagging receipts forced the Government to run \$5 billion or more in the red.

The President proposed raising the permanent debt ceiling to \$288 billion, to be increased for one year to \$295 billion. The House Ways and Means Committee voted instead to make \$285 billion the permanent limit, adding another \$10 billion to expire June 30, 1960. These were the terms of a bill passed by the House June 19, by a 256-117 vote, and by the Senate June 25, by voice vote. Even should no deficit develop by the end of fiscal 1960, the new debt limit was such that Congress would have to take further action at the 1960 session.

● **FNMA Exchange:** As part of his budget-balancing plan, the President proposed exchanging \$335 million worth of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association for an equal amount of long-term Treasury bonds held by the public. The complex transaction was designed to permit the Treasury to retire the bonds, reducing the public debt by an equivalent amount, and to allow FNMA to operate without additional budgetary expenditure in 1960.

Although the President had ample authority to go ahead with the exchange, he held off when Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D Pa.) and other Democrats on the Banking and Currency Committee objected. They complained that the deal would cost the Government at least \$13 million a year, representing the difference between the interest received by FNMA on its 4 percent mortgages and the interest paid by the Treasury on its 2.75 percent bonds, part of a non-marketable series maturing in 1980. The exchange, Clark said, would give the bondholders a "windfall" and have a "severely depressing effect" on the mortgage market.

After extended debate, the Senate Aug. 20 voted 56-29 in favor of a resolution (S Res 130) expressing the sense of the Senate that the proposed exchange should not be carried out. No Democrats voted against the resolution, while only three Republicans voted for it. Whether the President would be guided by it was open to question at adjournment.

● **Interest Ceiling:** Neither of the foregoing matters produced half the storm caused by the President's request that Congress remove the statutory limit of 4.25 percent on the interest the Treasury may offer on its long-term bonds (five years or more). Democrats greeted the proposal as irrefutable proof of their charge that the Administration was committed to a policy of high interest rates.

Whatever the cause, both short- and long-term interest rates did rise in 1959, with costly results for the Treasury. Its estimate of the cost of carrying the debt in 1960 was raised by \$500 million, to \$8.5 billion. At the same time, long-term Government bonds were selling below par; with little hope of being able to float new long-term issues at 4.25 percent or less, the Treasury faced the prospect of having to rely increasingly on the highly volatile short-term market for its financing needs.

The House Ways and Means Committee first agreed to give the President authority for two years to raise the ceiling when necessary. But it added a rider which (in effect) told the Federal Reserve Board to help peg the price of Government bonds. In the face of adamant Administration opposition, this provision was toned down, but on Aug. 18 the Committee reversed itself and voted to shelve the entire bill.

No great objection was voiced, however, to the President's concurrent request for an increase in the interest ceiling on Series E and H savings bonds. The House passed the required legislation (HR 9035) on Sept. 4, by a 378-7 vote, after rejecting a move to attach a provision removing the ceiling on long-term bonds, by a 134-255 vote. (See House Roll Call No. 12, p. 28.) The Senate passed a somewhat different version Sept. 8. The compromise measure, sent to the President Sept. 12, raised the interest limit on Series E and H bonds from 3.26 to 4.25 percent.

TVA Revenue Bonds

Both Democrats and the President favored giving the Tennessee Valley Authority the right to finance the expansion and improvement of its power facilities by selling up to \$750 million worth of revenue bonds. But the Administration insisted that the Budget Bureau have the power to pass on TVA power projects.

A bill (HR 3460) reported to the House April 14 provided, instead, that Congress have the right to approve or veto the projects. An effort to substitute the Administration's control provisions was rejected by the House, 182-231, and the bill was passed May 7, by a 245-170 vote. (See House Roll Call No. 2, p. 26) The Senate's version of HR 3460, passed July 9, differed in several respects, but retained a degree of Congressional control which the President said conflicted with "his constitutional role in the legislative process" and was "wholly unacceptable."

The impasse was broken when the President signed the bill Aug. 6 on the understanding that the offending provision would be repealed. A bill doing just that was promptly sent to the White House, Aug. 11.

Inflation vs. Growth

Underlying the entire fiscal debate of 1959 was this question: was it more important to fight inflation or to encourage a faster rate of economic growth? The President made no bones about his conviction that the danger of inflation exceeded all others; balancing the Federal budget, he said in his Economic Report of Jan. 20, was the "most important single step" the Government could take to stabilize prices. A growing number of Democrats, on the other hand, saw a greater threat in the high rate of growth of the Soviet economy; the Government's principal concern, they argued, should be to stimulate a higher rate of growth in the U.S. economy.

This was the view endorsed by the Democratic majority of the Joint Economic Committee, in its March 9 appraisal of the President's Economic Report. They called in particular for relaxation of the Administration's restraints on the growth of the money supply. Republican members, denouncing the "partisan political tone" of the majority report, argued that "stabilizing the price level...is a basic requisite for continuing growth."

Both sides to the dispute took steps to carry their views to the public at large. On Jan. 31 the President named Vice President Richard M. Nixon as chairman of a new Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. In an interim report June 29, the Committee said the economy was "now at a critical juncture urgently requiring action to forestall inflation." The required action, it said, included balancing the budget, raising the interest ceiling on Treasury bonds, and amending the Employment Act of 1946, adding to its goals of "maximum production, employment, and purchasing power" that of "reasonable price stability."

Democrats countered by pushing through a resolution March 23 giving the Joint Economic Committee \$200,000 to conduct a "Study of Employment, Growth, and Price Levels." Chaired by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.), an inveterate critic of Administration fiscal policies, the Committee was expected to complete its study early in 1960.

Meanwhile, neither Congress nor the Administration produced any concrete antidote to rising prices. Confronted with a steel strike beginning July 15, the President repeated his earlier appeals to labor and management to write a non-inflationary contract. By adjournment, however, the strike was still underway, and the President had made no move to intervene.

The House Government Operations Committee June 12 reported a bill (HR 6263) empowering the President to hold public hearings when price or wage increases threatened to have an inflationary impact. No further action was taken; it seemed doubtful that a majority in Congress would support it. But the debate over inflation and growth -- and what to do about both -- was certain to wax hotter in 1960, as the Presidential election approached.

Civil Benefits

Housing Law Became Focus of "Spending" Debate

A session-long deadlock over housing legislation was broken Sept. 10 when Congress, after having failed to override vetoes of two earlier versions, finally sent the President a bill he was willing to sign. Such were its terms that both parties to the long, angry "spending" debate could claim at least partial victory. But the bill was a far cry from what either the President or the Democratic majority had wanted.

At the heart of the controversy was the 10-year-old urban renewal program. A bill extending the program for six years, at the rate of \$300 million a year, had cleared the Senate in 1958 only to die in the House for lack of six votes. As the 86th Congress convened, big-city Democrats began a drive for an even larger program. The Administration's bill, on the other hand, called for a six-year extension, at the rate of \$250 million a year for the first three years and \$200 million a year for the last three. The Administration also wanted to cut the Federal share of any community's loss on slum clearance projects from two-thirds to one-half by fiscal 1963.

Round One: As reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the first housing bill of 1959 (S 57) carried a six-year extension of the urban renewal program at \$350 million a year, as well as an Administration-opposed authorization for another 35,000 units of public housing. After rejecting several moves to water down these provisions, the Senate passed S 57 on Feb. 5, by a 60-28 vote.

On Feb. 27 the House Banking and Currency Committee reported its version of S 57, allotting \$500 million a year to urban renewal for three years. Almost three months passed, however, before the bill was dislodged from the Rules Committee, and the House, after rejecting an Administration-backed substitute by a 189-234 vote, passed S 57 May 21 by a 261-160 vote.

Anxious to forestall a veto if possible, Senate and House conferees cut the urban renewal extension to two years and a total of \$900 million. But the Administration still took strong exception to this and 14 other provisions of the compromise bill. With most Republicans voting "nay", the Senate approved the conference report June 22, 56-31, and the House followed suit June 23, 241-177.

In a strongly-worded message July 7, President Eisenhower vetoed S 57 as being "so excessive in the spending it proposes, and so defective in other respects, that it would do far more damage than good." He urged Congress to enact his original proposals.

Round Two: After mulling the matter for another month, Senate Democrats decided to try over-

riding the veto. But the 55-40 vote Aug. 12 was nine votes short of the required two-thirds majority. (See Senate Roll Call No. 11, p. 31.) The Banking Committee promptly reported a revised measure (S 2539) containing a few concessions to the Administration but a number of objectionable features as well. After rejecting several attempts to eliminate these, the Senate passed the bill Aug. 18, by a 71-24 vote. The House then passed the bill Aug. 27 without change, by a 283-105 vote. (See House Roll Call No. 10, p. 28.)

On Sept. 3 the President vetoed S 2539; like S 57, he said, it "goes too far." He criticized in particular its provisions for two new direct loan programs -- \$50 million for college classrooms and \$50 million for housing for the elderly; for 37,000 new units of public housing; for a one-year authorization of \$650 million in urban renewal grants; and for limiting an \$8-billion increase in the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage-insurance authority to one year.

Again the Senate attempted and failed to override the President's veto. The vote Sept. 4 was 58-36, five short of the necessary two-thirds. (See Senate Roll Call No. 12, p. 31.)

Round Three: In quick order the Banking Committee reported a new measure (S 2654) making three concessions to the President: FHA authority to insure mortgages was extended indefinitely; the \$50-million loan fund for college classrooms was dropped; and the \$650-million authorization for urban renewal grants was spread over two years. Chairman A. Willis Robertson (D Va.) said he had "positive assurance" that the President would sign the bill, although it still contained the provisions for elderly and public housing to which he had objected.

The Senate passed S 2654 Sept. 9 without change, by an 86-7 vote. Next day the House, by voice vote, sent it to the President. Entitled the Housing Act of 1959, it included these major provisions:

- Increased the total amount of mortgages FHA can insure by \$8 billion; increased the maximum FHA mortgage on a one-family home from \$20,000 to \$22,500; and reduced the down-payment required on homes valued at \$13,500-\$18,000 to 10 percent.

- Authorized urban renewal grants, under contract authority, amounting to \$350 million in fiscal 1960 and \$300 million in fiscal 1961, and liberalized important features of the slum clearance program.

- Established a \$50 million fund for direct loans to non-profit corporations providing rental housing for the elderly.

- Increased the college housing loan fund by \$250 million, to a total of \$1,175,000,000.

- Authorized Federal subsidization of an additional 37,000 units of public housing.

Aid to Education

Congress voted \$431 million to the Office of Education in 1959, including \$225 million for grants to so-called "impacted areas" and \$150 million for loans and grants under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. For the fifth year running, however, the legislators failed to enact a general school construction bill. Enthusiasm for a generous program of Federal grants, once fairly widespread, appeared to have slackened.

After recommending various grant formulas in 1955, 1956, and 1957, the Administration in 1959 switched to a new approach designed to produce the minimum impact on the 1960 budget. Unveiled Feb. 9 by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, it provided for joint Federal-state assistance to communities in paying off bonds issued to finance school construction. Cost to the Federal Government was estimated at \$2 billion over the next 25 to 30 years.

Congress ignored the Administration's proposals and turned instead to the so-called Murray-Metcalf bill (S 2, HR 22), which provided \$4.7 billion a year in outright grants to the states, to be used either for building schools or raising teachers' salaries. On June 8 the House Education and Labor Committee reported a scaled-down version of HR 22, authorizing grants equivalent to \$25 a year for each school-age child, at a total cost of \$4.4 billion over four years.

When this bill was pigeonholed by the House Rules Committee, Democrats on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee cooked up a bill, modeled on the President's 1957 proposals, providing for a two-year program of matching grants for school construction only, at the rate of \$500 million a year. Reported Sept. 12, this bill (S 8) failed to reach the Senate floor before adjournment.

On other matters of interest to educators, Congress performed as follows:

- **Impacted Areas:** Secretary Flemming asked Congress May 12 to revise sharply two grant programs, first authorized in 1950, designed to help build and operate schools in areas overburdened by an influx of Federal or defense workers and their families. But the proposed changes (which would have reduced Federal outlays by \$61 million the first year) were rejected Aug. 26 by the House General Education Subcommittee.

- **Loyalty Oaths:** In establishing a program of Federal loans to college students, Congress in 1958 stipulated that all applicants must swear allegiance to the United States and file affidavits stating they do not support any organization intent on overthrowing the U.S. Government. When several colleges withdrew from the loan program in protest against this requirement, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee June 29 reported a bill to eliminate the loyalty oath. After two days of heated debate, however, the Senate July 23 voted 49-42 to recommit the bill (S 819) to committee, effectively killing it for the 1959 session.

- **Scientific Equipment:** When an American importer found a ready market among U.S. schools for low-priced Soviet laboratory equipment, Congress reacted promptly to the challenge. On the initiative of Sen. Styles Bridges (R N.H.), the legislators added a rider to the Office of Education appropriation, prohibiting the use of funds, authorized by the Defense Education Act for purchasing any equipment from a Communist country, unless unavailable elsewhere.

- **Educational Television:** As it had in 1958, the Senate April 13 passed a bill (S 12) authorizing up to \$1 million in Federal grants to each state to assist non-profit groups and school systems in purchasing equipment for broadcasting educational TV programs. But a House Commerce Subcommittee voted June 3 to defer action on the bill until 1960.

- **Youth Corps:** By a 47-45 vote, the Senate Aug. 13 passed a bill (S 812) to create a Federal Youth Conservation Corps of 150,000 men between the ages of 16 and 21, to work on Federal and state conservation projects. Sponsored by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.), the measure was opposed by the Administration chiefly because of its cost, estimated at a minimum of \$375 million a year. The House took no action on the bill, however.

Health Measures

The only appropriation bill enacted in 1959 to provide a larger sum than requested was the Labor-HEW measure. As sent to the President July 30, it carried \$3,951,000,000 for the two Departments, or \$259 million more than budgeted. Most of these extra funds were earmarked for health programs. Appropriations for the National Institutes of Health were increased by \$106 million, to \$400 million; funds to finance Federal grants for hospital construction were raised by \$85 million, to \$186 million.

President Eisenhower signed the bill Aug. 14 but took strong exception to the additions made by Congress, indicating that the Administration might simply refuse to spend the extra money.

- **Forand Bill:** A highly controversial proposal to incorporate a program of health insurance for the aged in the social security system was the subject of five days of testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in mid-July. Sponsored by Rep. Aime J. Forand (D R.I.), the bill (HR 4700) received no further action in 1959. Its chances in 1960 -- an election year -- were another matter.

- **Health for Peace:** By a 63-17 vote, the Senate May 20 passed a bill (S J Res 41) to establish a "Health for Peace" program of international medical research, at a cost of \$50 million a year. Sponsored by Sen. Lister Hill (D Ala.), the bill drew only a highly qualified endorsement from the Administration, which objected to most of the terms of the measure. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Aug. 28 announced its decision to postpone action on the bill until 1960.

Airport Grants

Neither Congress nor the President won any new ground in their dispute over extending the Federal Airport Act of 1946, authorizing matching grants to cities for building airports. He proposed that the Federal Government "begin an orderly withdrawal" from the program by cutting annual grants (established at \$63 million in 1955) back to \$35 million over a four-year period. But the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Feb. 5 reported a bill (S 1) even larger than one the President had refused to sign in 1958. It called for a five-year extension of the program, at \$100 million a year, plus a \$65 million emergency fund.

The Senate voted to hold the extension to four years, but rejected, 35-53, a substitute proposal for continuing the program without change, before passing S 1 on Feb. 6, by a 63-22 vote. The House Commerce Committee, however, cut S 1 from \$465 million to \$297 million, allowing only \$62 million a year for regular grants and \$45 million for the emergency fund. On the House floor, a move to trim another \$97 million from the bill was barely defeated, on a 194-214 vote March 19. The House then passed the bill, 272-134.

Weeks passed before conferees were named, as Democratic leaders pondered what course to follow. Rather than risk a veto that couldn't be overridden, they finally compromised on a simple two-year extension of the existing program, at the rate of \$63 million a year. In this form, S 1 was approved by the Senate June 15, by a 71-11 vote, and by the House June 17, by a standing vote. President Eisenhower signed the measure June 29.

Area Redevelopment

Congress made even less progress in 1959 than in 1958 toward enacting a Federal program to help redevelop areas of the country suffering from chronic unemployment. As a result, President Eisenhower, who had vetoed a \$280-million measure the previous year, was spared the trouble in 1959.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee March 18 reported a bill (S 722) sponsored by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.) calling for \$390 million in loans and grants to industrial areas with high and sustained levels of unemployment and to low-income rural areas. In the Senate, a move to substitute the Administration's \$50-million loans-only proposal was rejected, 43-52. The Douglas bill was passed, March 23, by a 49-46 vote.

When the House Banking and Currency Committee reported S 722 May 14, its total cost had been trimmed to \$251 million. But the bill never got to the House floor; the Rules Committee, which had cleared the measure in 1958, refused to do so in 1959. The ultimate fate of S 722 would thus be determined in 1960.

Pollution Control

Both the House and the Senate agreed in 1959 to enlarge a program enacted in 1956 to encourage cities to build sewage treatment plants, in an effort to increase the amount of usable water in the nation. At the last moment, however, the bill was put on ice by its sponsors, who feared a pocket veto.

Under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, the Federal Government was authorized to grant up to \$50 million a year for 10 years to help cities build sewage plants. (Actual appropriations for the program have been \$45 million a year.) In 1959 the President asked Congress to cut the payments to \$20 million, and to turn the entire program back to the states in fiscal 1961 (see p. 22).

Ignoring his request, the House June 9 voted 255-143 to pass a bill (HR 3610) doubling the authorization for grants, to \$100 million a year. An amended version of the bill, raising the program to \$80 million a year, was passed by the Senate Sept. 9, by a vote of 61-27. Then, although they were prepared to compromise, Democratic sponsors of the measure decided to put off final action until 1960, when their chances of overriding a veto might be somewhat improved.

Air Pollution: Congress completed action Sept. 14 on a bill extending for four years the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955, authorizing \$5 million a year for research studies by the U.S. Public Health Service into the causes and control of air pollution.

Business Aids

Merchant Marine: President Eisenhower, in his budget message, suggested that it was high time to overhaul the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but Congress took no action pending receipt of a Commerce Department transportation study, still incomplete at adjournment. The House and Senate passed substantially different versions of a bill (HR 5421) to subsidize the construction of fishing vessels, but were unable to reach a compromise. A Senate-passed bill (S 107) to make floating drydocks eligible for Federal mortgage insurance never reached the House.

Railroads: Senate and House Commerce Committees both approved bills designed to permit higher rental charges on box cars as an inducement to railroads to build more freight cars. Further action was postponed until 1960. So, also, was action on bills to revise the Transportation Act of 1958, to make it harder for railroads to abandon commuter service when found to be unprofitable.

Small Business: On Sept. 11 Congress completed action on a bill (HR 8599) raising the Small Business Administration's revolving business loan fund from \$500 million to \$550 million. (SBA had wanted an increase to \$700 million.) Another bill requested by SBA, to liberalize the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, passed the Senate Sept. 10 but was not considered by the House.

Veterans' Benefits

The Veterans Pension Act of 1959, sent to the President Aug. 18, provided for a major revision in the benefits to which needy veterans with non-service-connected disabilities or their widows and children are entitled. For the present system of flat monthly payments to all eligible persons, it substituted a sliding-scale of benefits related to other income, with the proviso that no one presently on the rolls would be forced to take a cut. About 70 percent of the 1,250,000 veterans, widows and orphans eligible for payments were expected to receive larger benefits effective July 1, 1960.

Costs of the measure were a matter of some dispute. As first drafted by the Veterans Administration, it would have added \$100 million to the \$1.1 billion cost of the pension program in its first year, but would have reduced the Government's cumulative outlay over the next 40 years from an estimated \$105 billion to \$57 billion. But as passed by the House June 15, the bill (HR 7650) raised the first-year cost by \$300 million and the total cost by the year 2000 to \$115 billion. The chief reason for this was that the House bill added 206,000 widows of World War II and Korean war veterans to the rolls, at a 40-year cost of \$22 billion.

The Senate Finance Committee proceeded to trim the bill in several respects, cutting its 40-year cost by an estimated \$21 billion. But the Senate, by a vote of 75-20, accepted an amendment by Sen. Robert S. Kerr (D Okla.) restoring all of the more generous provisions in the House version. (See Senate Roll Call No. 10, p. 31.) Passage came Aug. 13, by a vote of 86-6. As finally enacted, HR 7650 --

- Provided a sliding-scale of pensions for veterans of World War I and II and the Korean war, ranging from \$85 a month for single veterans with incomes of \$600 or less, to \$45 a month for veterans with dependents and incomes between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

- Provided pensions for widows of veterans ranging from \$25 a month for those without children and incomes between \$1,200 and \$1,800, to \$75 a month for those with one child and incomes of \$1,000 or less, plus \$15 for each additional child.

- Provided that no person on the pension rolls would have his pension revoked or reduced when the law went into effect on July 1, 1960.

Readjustment Benefits: In separate action, the Senate July 21 voted 57-31 to pass a bill (S 1138) extending readjustment benefits such as guaranteed home loans to veterans who entered the armed services after Jan. 31, 1955, the cut-off date for the Korean GI bill. But the House Veterans' Affairs Committee postponed action on the bill until 1960.

Veterans' Housing: When the omnibus housing bill ran into trouble, Congress sent the President a separate bill June 17 raising the interest ceiling on VA-guaranteed mortgages from 4.75 to 5.25 percent, and authorizing another \$100 million for direct housing loans to veterans. It was signed June 30.

Labor Aids

Much of the steam generated in 1958 over unemployment and jobless benefits evaporated in 1959, as the recession gave way to recovery. By adjournment, Congress had taken only limited action on the following related matters:

- **Temporary Benefits:** The Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, providing Federal loans to the states to extend jobless benefits for a limited period, was due to expire April 1, 1959. The House March 16 passed a bill (HR 5640) to permit persons who had exhausted regular benefits and applied for the special additional benefits before April 1 to continue receiving payments through June 30.

In the Senate efforts were made to broaden the bill: an amendment to extend the terminal date to June 30, 1960 was rejected, 38-49, but another amendment to extend all provisions of the 1958 law until June 30, 1959 was adopted, 52-32. House conferees refused to accept the change, however, and it was the House version that went to the President March 25.

- **Regular Benefits:** The House Ways and Means Committee opened hearings April 7 on various proposals for establishing minimum Federal standards and enlarging the coverage provided by state unemployment compensation programs. The Administration favored the latter objective but opposed setting minimum standards as to the duration and amount of benefits that should be paid, preferring to leave improvements in this area to the states. Labor spokesmen argued for high minimum standards. But the Committee took no further action.

- **Minimum Wage:** Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell March 12 asked Congress to delay raising the minimum wage above \$1 an hour, but to extend coverage to "several million additional workers." After extensive hearings, Sen. John F. Kennedy's (D Mass.) Labor Subcommittee approved a bill (S 1046) to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to extend coverage to an additional 10 million workers. But the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee never acted on the measure.

- **Unemployment Study:** At the behest of Sen. Johnson, the Senate April 10 passed a bill to set up an 11-member Commission on Unemployment Problems, with orders to report to Congress within 60 days. But the proposal met with vast indifference in the House, and the bill never left the Speaker's desk. On the eve of adjournment, however, Johnson persuaded the Senate to adopt a resolution creating a special Committee on Unemployment Problems, to be composed of nine Senators. The group was given \$100,000 and directed to report its findings by Jan. 31, 1960.

- **Railroad Retirement:** President Eisenhower May 19 signed a bill it had been feared he might veto. The measure (HR 5610) raised by 10 percent, pensions, annuities and survivor benefits of railroad workers. To pay for the increase, the bill raised employer and employee taxes from 6.25 percent to 7.25 percent by 1962.

Agriculture

Congress failed in 1959 to make any perceptible progress toward solving the farm surplus problem -- epitomized for the average taxpayer by the Federal Government's \$9 billion (and growing) investment in wheat, corn, cotton and other commodities. When the President vetoed two bills revising price supports for wheat and tobacco, the legislators gave up any hope of coming to terms with the Administration.

In a special message to Congress Jan. 29, the President proposed that price supports for all 12 subsidized commodities be related to a percentage of their average market prices for the immediately preceding years, rather than to parity -- the standard which reflects cost-price relationships of a base period, usually 1910-14. If Congress didn't care for this, he said, it should give Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson authority to fix price supports at any level, from 0 to 90 percent of parity.

Wheat was the immediate problem. Under existing conditions Government stocks of wheat were expected to reach 1.5 billion bushels by mid-1960 -- more than twice the amount consumed as food by the nation in one year. Benson urged Congress to give him the flexibility asked by the President; strict production controls, he said, were the only alternative. But the legislators refused to go along.

Wheat Program: The Senate May 22 passed instead a bill giving wheat growers a choice of three courses: (1) planting their full acreage allotment and receiving a support price of 65 percent of parity, (2) reducing their allotment by 10 percent and receiving 75 percent of parity (the current support level), or (3) reducing their allotment 20 percent and receiving 80 percent of parity.

The House version, passed June 12 by a 189-177 vote, provided two quite different alternatives; a choice between receiving price supports at 90 percent of parity in return for reducing acreage allotments by 25 percent, or accepting 50 percent of parity with unlimited production.

Both versions were dropped in conference in favor of a single formula, offering 80-percent supports for a 20 percent cut in acreage. The Senate promptly endorsed the compromise, but the House voted 202-214 to reject it, insisting on its own version. On June 22 the Senate agreed, 44-40, to accept the House bill. Three days later the President vetoed it, saying it "prescribes for a sick patient another dose of what caused his illness." The bill would do nothing to limit wheat production, he said, since farmers would simply grow more on a smaller acreage.

Tobacco Supports: The Senate May 21 passed a bill to stabilize price supports for tobacco at the 1958 level until 90 percent of parity, computed by the old method of determining parity, exceeded the 1958 level, at which time the support level would rise to 90 percent. The House passed the bill June 10, by a 250-149 vote, but the President vetoed it June 25, along with the wheat bill. It would take a "long step

backward," he said, "by resurrecting 90 percent of 'old parity'" as a support formula. As with wheat, Congress took no further action.

Surplus Disposal: The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, a major instrument in helping to move several billion dollars worth of U.S. farm commodities abroad, was due to expire on Dec. 30, 1959. The President asked Congress to extend the law (familiarily known as PL 480) for one year and to authorize \$1.5 billion to finance sales for foreign currencies under Title I, plus \$300 million for relief donations under Title II.

A bill along these lines was passed by the House Aug. 20, after Members had voted 232-127 to attach a provision authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a \$1-billion food stamp system for distributing surplus food to needy persons. The Senate Sept. 7 voted 68-14 for a three-year extension of PL 480 with a modest food-stamp demonstration plan. The conference report, approved Sept. 11 by both chambers, provided for a two-year extension of the surplus disposal program, with \$1.5 billion a year for foreign-currency sales and \$300 million a year for donations. The bill also contained a permissive food-stamp provision for which Secretary Benson said he saw "no need."

REA Veto: In a slap at Benson, the Senate April 8 passed a bill, 60-27, giving the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, final authority to approve or disapprove REA loan applications. A similar bill passed the House April 15, by a 254-131 vote. But on April 27 President Eisenhower vetoed the measure as marking "a major retreat from sound administrative policy and practice."

Although the bill was of minor significance, Democratic leaders determined to override the veto. The Senate succeeded April 28, by a 64-29 vote -- two more than needed. But the 280-146 vote in the House April 30 was four votes shy of the required two-thirds majority. (See House Roll Call No. 7, p. 28) This setback on the first attempt of the session to put the President in his place persuaded Democratic leaders to lower their sights on other controversial legislation.

School Milk: In separate bills sent to the President March 25 and Aug. 6, Congress raised the \$75-million ceiling on expenditures by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the special school milk program to \$78 million for fiscal 1959, \$81 million for fiscal 1960, and \$84 million for fiscal 1961. The increase of \$3 million each year was needed, sponsors said, to keep pace with the expanding school population.

Hog Subsidies: The House Agriculture Committee Aug. 27 reported a bill (HR 8394) to establish a direct payment plan for hogs, designed to assure producers a return of \$14 per hundred pounds. Opposed by the Administration, the bill received no further action. But the Agriculture Department promptly embarked upon a substantial pork-purchase program to help bolster sagging hog prices.

Natural Resources

The "spending" issue served to dampen somewhat the interest of Congress in developing the nation's natural resources -- but not entirely. In what proved to be the session's most dramatic display of legislative independence, Congress overrode the President's veto of a public works bill -- the first and only time it had successfully defied Mr. Eisenhower since he entered the White House.

With Federal expenditures for natural resources estimated at a record level of \$1.7 billion in 1960, the President insisted that no funds be provided for starting construction of new water resources projects. But Congress was in no mood to go along. In reporting a bill June 2 appropriating almost \$1.2 billion for various public works, the House Appropriations Committee included funds for a flock of new flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects. There had been "overwhelming bipartisan rejection of the Administration's 'no new starts' policy," the Committee said. The House passed the bill June 9, by a vote of 380-20.

The Senate Appropriations Committee then added another batch of new projects to the bill, boosting the total appropriation by \$80 million. On the Senate floor, a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to trim it was rejected, 17-72. On July 9, the Senate passed the bill, 82-7. The compromise version, which reached the President Aug. 17, came to \$30 million more than the budget request and provided for starts on 67 projects he opposed.

Vetoing the measure Aug. 28, the President said "overspending in respect to water resources is hurtful to the United States." He asked that Congress eliminate the unbudgeted projects, which he said would cost \$800 million to complete. In a hectic scene Sept. 2, accompanied by a number of vote switches, the House voted 274-138 to override the veto -- one short of the required two-thirds majority. (See House Roll Call No. 8, p. 28.)

The narrow defeat spurred the House Appropriations Committee to report back a new bill (HR 9105) changed in only one respect. By a 2.5 percent across-the-board cut, the Committee came within earshot of the total budget request. But the bill still contained the 67 unwanted projects. Both chambers endorsed the measure Sept. 8, the House by a 304-93 vote, the Senate by a 73-15 vote. Again the President refused to sign, returning HR 9105 Sept. 9.

Next day, on the vote to override the second veto, the House finally succeeded. The 280-121 ballot turned up 12 votes more than were needed -- 10 of them being Republicans who had voted to sustain the first veto. (See House Roll Call No. 9, p. 28). The Senate immediately followed suit, voting 72-23 to override -- eight more than required. (See Senate Roll Call No. 14, p. 32.) Democrats were elated by the victory, but its value remained to be determined. The President had the power to freeze the unbudgeted funds if he so desired.

In separate action, the House July 16 passed a bill (HR 7634) authorizing \$637 million for navigation and flood control projects, but the Senate took no action. Congress traditionally passes the so-called rivers and harbors bill, authorizing projects for which funds are later voted in the public works appropriation bill, in even-numbered years.

Mineral Policy: In 1958 the Senate approved but the House rejected an Administration sponsored price-support program for lead, zinc, and other minerals, designed to meet the complaints of domestic producers against cheaper imports. The President subsequently placed a quota on lead and zinc imports, but the domestic industry continued to press for more relief. Finally, on Sept. 10, Congress adopted a resolution (H Con Res 177) calling on the President to look into the problem and recommend legislation. A stronger Senate-passed measure (S 1537) failed to obtain House action.

Alaska Leases: President Eisenhower Aug. 17 vetoed a bill increasing from 300,000 to 600,000 acres the limitation on oil and gas leases or options that can be held by a producer in Alaska. The bill, he said, "would tend to produce an excessive concentration of control" over potential resources.

Coal Research: Congress Aug. 31 completed action on a bill (HR 6596) establishing a three-member Coal Research and Development Commission, with the task of finding new and more effective uses for coal. But the President vetoed the bill Sept. 16, saying it would lead to duplication of effort.

Wilderness Bill: Hearings were held by the Senate Interior Committee on a bill (S 1123, HR 1960) to set aside permanently as wilderness a portion of Federally owned lands amounting to about 2 percent of the land area of the nation. But on Aug. 28 the Committee decided to postpone further action on the measure until 1960.

Water Resources: The Senate April 20 adopted a resolution establishing a Select National Water Resources Committee, to be composed of 16 Senators. The Committee was given \$175,000 and ordered to file a report by Jan. 31, 1961 recommending legislation on water projects that would be needed by 1980. The Committee chose Sen. Robert S. Kerr (D Okla.) as its Chairman.

Lake Michigan: Possibly the windiest debate of the 1959 session was prompted by HR 1, a bill to permit Chicago to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan into its sanitary canal system. Similar bills had been passed in 1954 and 1956 only to be vetoed by the President, largely because they were offensive to Canada, which claimed the water-diversion proposal would adversely affect navigation on the Great Lakes.

The House passed HR 1 March 13, by a 238-142 vote. Senate debate began Aug. 26 and droned on until Sept. 2, when after six roll calls on various motions, the Senate voted 54-34 to send the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee -- effectively killing the measure for 1959.

Mutual Security Request Slashed By \$1.2 Billion

The foreign aid debate of 1959 revealed a growing concern in Congress over the rationale, no less than the cost, of the semi-permanent, hydra-headed Mutual Security Program. But a serious effort to reorient the program fell afoul of the "spending" issue. Stung by the Administration's opposition to their domestic welfare proposals, Democrats led the way in slashing the President's foreign aid request by \$1.2 billion.

In a special message March 13, he asked Congress to authorize and appropriate \$3,930,000,000 to continue MSP without substantial change. Included was \$1.6 billion for military aid, \$835 million for defense support (economic aid to 12 military allies), \$272 million for special assistance, \$180 million for technical cooperation, \$700 million for the Development Loan Fund, and \$200 million for contingencies.

Authorization: After lengthy hearings, the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported an authorization measure June 5 providing \$267 million less than requested. The Committee had cut the military aid, defense support, and special assistance estimates by about 10 percent each, but had voted \$800 million for the DLF. This was reduced to \$700 million by the House, but 24 other amendments, most of which proposed further restrictions or cuts in the program, were rejected. As passed June 18, by a 271-142 vote, the measure authorized \$3,542,600,000 for MSP. (See House Roll Call No. 3, p. 26.)

The version reported June 22 by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, however, authorized \$255 million more than the President's request. While approving most of the Administration's proposals, the Committee, in a sharp break with precedent, inserted a provision sponsored by Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) authorizing the Development Loan Fund to borrow \$1 billion a year from the Treasury for five years. The Committee said its action, taken "in the absence of Administration initiative," was designed to help "induce a rate of growth which promises to become self-sustaining" in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

This provision met overwhelming opposition in the Senate. Critics called it a "backdoor spending" permit, allowing money to be taken from the Treasury without appropriation. When a point of order was made against the provision, and was overruled by the Presiding Officer, a motion to table an appeal from the ruling was rejected, by a 42-48 vote. (See Senate Roll Call No. 7, p. 31.)

Faced with the prospect that the Senate would vote to sustain the point of order, and thus bring into question the legality of other large Government programs financed by borrowing authority, Democratic and Republican leaders skirted the issue by

offering a compromise provision, quickly accepted, which authorized appropriations of \$750 million for the DLF for fiscal 1960 and another \$1.25 billion for fiscal 1961.

The Senate then agreed to an amendment cutting military assistance from \$1.6 billion to \$1.3 billion, by a 52-41 vote (see Senate Roll Call No. 8, p. 31) and to one reducing defense support by 10 percent. As passed July 8, after six days of debate, the bill's total authorization had been cut to the figure approved by the House. As sent to the President July 22, the measure authorized \$700 million for the DLF in fiscal 1960, plus \$1.1 billion in 1961, and \$1.4 billion for military aid.

More important, perhaps, than the money provisions were the policy directives added to the bill. These provided for shifting military aid to the defense budget, beginning in fiscal 1961; directing the President to submit a detailed plan for the progressive reduction of all bilateral grant assistance; and establishing in the State Department an Inspector General and Controller to audit the aid program.

Appropriation: As usual, Congress appropriated less money than it had authorized. Less than \$3.2 billion was provided in the money bill reported to the House July 24 -- \$390 million less than had been authorized, and \$743 million less than the President had first requested. (The same day he asked Congress to give the Development Loan Fund another \$500 million as a down payment for fiscal 1961, but neither chamber moved to grant the request.)

As passed by the House July 29, by a 279-136 vote, the appropriation measure carried \$1.3 billion for military assistance, \$700 million for defense support, and \$550 million for the DLF. When the Senate Appropriations Committee finally reported its version Sept. 8, only \$95 million had been added, in sharp contrast to action taken in previous years.

Final action was delayed until the last hours of the session by the civil rights dispute. (See p. 20) Further cuts were rejected by the Senate, before passing the bill Sept. 14, by a 64-25 vote. As sent to the President, the final version provided a little more than \$3.2 billion for mutual security -- \$700 million less than his original request and \$1.2 billion under the final request.

Aid to Satellites: Under the 1951 Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act, any form of aid to countries in the Communist bloc was all but prohibited. An Administration-endorsed effort to ease the provision, as it applied to Poland and other satellites, was defeated by one vote in the Senate in 1958. But on Sept. 12, 1959, the Senate voted 49-40 to pass S 1697 amending the 1951 law. (See Senate Roll Call No. 15, p. 32) Passage came too late for House action.

President Assumes Personal Direction of Foreign Policy

The President embarked this year on the final great mission of his service, assuming leadership of U.S. foreign policy direction. Following the death May 24 of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, a new approach was seen in the management of foreign affairs. President Eisenhower assumed an attitude of moderation in the cold war, accompanied by diligent consultation with this Nation's Allies. Initiating an exchange of visits between the leaders of the U.S. and U.S.S.R., the President at the same time indicated great caution against a serious danger: the breakdown of the NATO defense alliance.

Dulles: On Feb. 14 the President announced that Secretary Dulles was suffering from a recurrence of the cancer for which he was operated on in 1956. He had entered Walter Reed Hospital for a hernia operation Feb. 11, the day after he returned from a week of Allied consultations in London, Paris and Bonn. Radiation treatment began Feb. 20, just five days before Dulles' 71st birthday. On April 15, the President announced Dulles' resignation.

Dulles was sworn in as a special consultant to the President on April 23, two days after Christian A. Herter, who had been Acting Secretary of State since Feb. 15, was confirmed by a 93-0 roll-call vote in the Senate as Secretary of State. Herter took the oath of office April 22 and departed April 27 for the Paris meeting of the Western foreign ministers in preparation for the May 11 Geneva foreign ministers conference on the Berlin crisis.

Dulles died in his sleep May 24 of cancer complicated by pneumonia. President Eisenhower called him "one of the truly great men of our time." Statesmen from around the world, including West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko attended the May 27 funeral.

Berlin: Tension leading to the events in which President Eisenhower became personally involved was created Nov. 10, 1958 when Khrushchev in a speech demanded an end of the four-power occupation of Berlin and threatened to turn control of Allied supply lines to West Berlin over to the East Germans, make West Berlin into a demilitarized "free city" and conclude a separate peace treaty with East Germany. This was followed up on Nov. 27, 1958 with a Soviet note to the Western nations setting May 27 as the deadline for the end of occupation of Berlin. The Western Big Three Dec. 14, 1958, rejected this ultimatum, stressing the right of free access to the city.

The crisis heightened in the months following: Dulles and Herter met with Allied leaders; Soviet Deputy Premiers Frol R. Kozlov and Anastas I. Mikoyan visited the U.S. and the latter suggested that the Soviet deadline might be extended if talks were

underway; President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan met in Washington March 21-23; the Allies gradually moved to a position indicating greater willingness to negotiate with Russia on the Berlin situation.

Finally, the foreign ministers of the Big Four met in Geneva May 11 to May 20 and July 13 to Aug. 5 and recessed without agreement except to meet again at a date and place to be decided.

Test Ban: Another Geneva conference, one that began Oct. 31, 1958, held greater promise than the Foreign Ministers meeting. Russian, British and U.S. representatives agreed on 17 articles of a 24-article treaty dealing with a ban on nuclear tests. They were still far apart on policing methods. The State Department Aug. 26 announced that President Eisenhower had ordered a two-month extension of the one-year moratorium on testing which began on Oct. 31, 1958. Britain and Russia agreed to the extension. The conferees agreed Aug. 20 to recess their talks until after the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings.

Nixon Trip: A dramatic example of top-level contacts across the Iron Curtain began when Vice President Richard M. Nixon left July 22 for a 13-day tour of Russia. President Eisenhower April 16 had announced the Nixon visit to open the U.S. exhibition in Moscow "on behalf of the American people."

Nixon's trip held not only the diplomatic stage-center but the political. It was considered very useful to his Presidential chances in 1960. Although his reception in Moscow airport was described as cool, the Russian crowds in the American exhibit, in Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk greeted him in large and friendly numbers.

Highlight of the trip was the running discussion -- part of it being the "kitchen debate" -- with Soviet Premier Khrushchev during a tour of the U.S. exhibition. Among the Russian leader's complaints was the July 17 proclamation by President Eisenhower designating the week beginning July 19 as Captive Nations Week. Khrushchev called it a "rude" interference in "our internal affairs."

Exchange of Visits: Most international events were overshadowed by the exchange of visits between the heads of government of the United States and Soviet Russia, proposed by President Eisenhower.

Preceding the visit of Khrushchev to the U.S., the President made an extensive tour from Aug. 26 to Sept. 7 to talk with Macmillan in London, French President Charles DeGaulle in Paris and Adenauer in Bonn. His trip was marked with a spirit of unity with leaders and acclaim from the people of Europe.

Khrushchev arrived in Washington Sept. 15. The Berlin situation, the crisis in Laos, and trade between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. were the principal subjects for discussion.

Other Aid Measures

In addition to the Mutual Security Act, action was taken to expand two existing economic aid institutions, create another and explore the need for two more.

World Bank, Monetary Fund: After a long wrangle, Congress authorized increases in the United States subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Monetary Fund received \$1,-375,000,000 and the World Bank, \$3,175,000,000; the entire \$4.5 billion was charged as a public debt transaction. The President asked that the Monetary Fund authorization be charged against the badly-unbalanced fiscal 1959 budget. The House agreed but the Senate insisted that it go into the precariously-balanced fiscal 1960 budget. In June, however, the Senate relented and the bill went through as the President had requested.

Inter-American Bank: Congress approved U.S. membership in a new Inter-American Development Bank, created to underwrite accelerated economic development in the Western Hemisphere. The President described the action as "a most significant step in the history of our economic relations with Latin America." Congress authorized a \$450 million contribution to the billion-dollar bank and later appropriated \$280 million of it.

International Development Assn.: After greeting the proposal with skepticism in 1958, the Administration in 1959 gave its blessing to the formation of an International Development Assn. (IDA) as an affiliate of the World Bank. Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson told Congress in August there appeared to be sufficient favorable reaction among World Bank member nations to warrant drafting a resolution for consideration by the World Bank board of governors at their meeting Sept. 28. The Senate in 1958 had called for a study of the IDA proposal introduced by Sen. A.S. Mike Monroney (D Okla.). If established, IDA would be financed by several countries and would make long-term, low-interest loans repayable, either entirely or in part, in local currencies.

South Asia Mission: The Senate directed the Administration's attention to another possible area of international assistance in a resolution asking the President to explore with other free nations the advisability of establishing a mission to consult with South Asian governments on their economic problems.

In its original form, the resolution was concerned only with supporting India's five-year development plan, but on the recommendation of the State Department it was broadened to include Pakistan, Burma, Afghanistan, Nepal and Ceylon, as well.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee said the South Asian area "clearly merits a review of its economic requirements, because developments there in the next decade are likely to have a profound effect on the concept of individual freedom and will be of vital concern to the United States."

Trade Policy

A bill to encourage private overseas investment by American firms was hammered out, but not reported, by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1959.

The measure, introduced by Rep. Hale Boggs (D La.), would offer United States companies an incentive to increase their foreign investments, and to reinvest their profits abroad, by permitting them to defer payment of U.S. taxes on their foreign earnings until they are returned to this country for distribution.

Another proposal would have reduced the maximum corporate tax rate on all foreign earnings from 52 to 38 percent -- as is now the case for companies doing business in the Western Hemisphere. But this was opposed by the Administration and dropped from the bill during committee deliberations.

Separate studies conducted for the Commerce and State Departments endorsed the principle of expanded private overseas investment. The reports stressed the belief that Government grants and loans were incapable of meeting the demand for capital in the underdeveloped countries abroad.

But a basic conflict developed between the backers of the Boggs bill and the Administration over the revenue and policy considerations of the overseas investment incentive program.

The Boggs bill would make the tax deferral advantages available to American firms doing business anywhere in the world -- even in highly-developed countries. The Treasury claimed that the revenue loss from a world-wide tax deferral program would be excessive, and the State Department said it would not meet the policy goal of channeling new private investment into the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Backers of the bill contended that the Treasury's estimates of tax revenue loss were exaggerated and said it was impractical to limit the incentives only to the underdeveloped countries. The underdeveloped lands, they said, would benefit from the world-wide tax deferral because the total supply of investment funds would be increased significantly by this program. Conflict over this issue kept the bill in committee throughout 1959.

Immigration

While it took no action in 1959 on the President's often-repeated requests for overhaul of the basic provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, Congress did deal with three special immigration problems and cleared the way for a special \$10 million U.S. contribution to the World Refugee Year program. The Government's discretionary authority to admit tubercular aliens was extended through June 30, 1961, and a program for non-quota admission of certain alien orphans adopted by American citizens was continued through June 30, 1960. The inspection requirements for aliens seeking admission to the mainland from Hawaii were eliminated.

Defense Budget Provoked Inconclusive Debate

President Eisenhower's decision to hold defense spending in fiscal 1960 to about \$41 billion provoked a wide-ranging debate in Congress over the adequacy of the nation's preparedness program. As usual, disagreements among the armed services provided much of the ammunition leveled by Democratic critics at the defense budget.

For weeks Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shuttled between Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to defend the pace and scope of the defense effort. As proof, McElroy cited a statement signed by the Joint Chiefs to the effect that the 1960 budget was "adequate" and contained "no serious gaps." Called to testify, the Chiefs affirmed this position, but also revealed that they had asked for a lot more money.

- Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, had cut Navy requests of \$17 to \$18 billion to \$14 billion, was allowed \$11.5 billion.

- Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, had asked for \$21.6 billion, was allowed \$18.7 billion.

- Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, had cut Army requests from \$13.6 billion to \$12.5 billion, was allowed only \$9.9 billion.

Questioning of the Chiefs and subordinate commanders revealed three major areas of dispute in the field of defense policy, as follows:

- **Missile Gap:** Included in the 1960 budget were substantial funds for developing intercontinental ballistic missiles -- the nearly-operational ATLAS, the second-generation TITAN, and the ultimate MINUTEMAN, all Air Force projects. But according to Sen. Stuart Symington (D Mo.), one-time Air Force Secretary, Soviet capacity for producing ICBMs would give them a 3-to-1 lead over the U.S. within a year or two, enabling them to "wipe out our entire manned and unmanned retaliatory force" at one blow.

McElroy at first disputed the existence of any missile gap, saying that by December the number of combat-ready ICBMs in the U.S. would be "within a few missiles of what we would expect the Russians to have about that time." Later, however, he acknowledged that "if the Russians use their capability to produce, they will have more ICBM weapons on launching pads than we do." Throughout the debate, however, he insisted that the U.S. would continue to maintain its superiority in over-all striking power without attempting to match the Soviets "missile for missile."

- **Air Defense:** The 1960 budget provided for continuing development of two competing air-defense systems, the Air Force's BOMARC and the Army's NIKE HERCULES, both designed for protection against enemy bombers rather than ICBMs. Contrary

to Army wishes, however, no funds were requested for production of the NIKE-ZEUS, the only missile on the horizon designed to cope with ICBMs.

This situation produced such a strong reaction from Congress that the Defense Department hastily drew up a new "master plan" for continental air defense, which was put before the Senate Armed Services Committee June 12. Details of the plan were withheld from the public; in deference to Congressional criticism, however, it provided for cutbacks in both the NIKE-HERCULES and BOMARC programs, and an increase for the ZEUS program.

- **Limited War:** In their never-ending competition for funds, the armed services continued to make the most of their differences over strategic doctrine. Faced with an Air Force budget almost as large as those of the Army and Navy combined, Gen. Taylor and Adm. Burke argued that the nation's atomic retaliatory power was already "excessive to requirements." Both stressed the need for building up Army and Navy capabilities for fighting limited wars. Gen. White of the Air Force, on the other hand, emphasized the threat of total war and the need for "a capability, in being, of destroying a significant part of the Soviet strategic nuclear delivery forces."

In the end, Congress agreed to give the Army some additional funds for modernizing its equipment (most of which was designed during World War II), but nothing approaching the \$3 billion a year sought by Gen. Taylor, who was retired for his troubles. Having failed in 1958 to dissuade the Administration from cutting the Army to 870,000 men and the Marine Corps to 175,000, the legislators made no further effort to restore the Army to its former strength of 900,000 but did provide funds to maintain 200,000 Marines.

The frustrations encountered by Congress in attempting to reconcile the conflicting views of the Administration and the individual services regarding the nation's defense needs produced new demands for reorganization of the Defense Department.

- Sen. Clair Engle (D Calif.), in a Senate speech Aug. 28, declared that reorganization "on the basis of mission and function is an absolute prerequisite to meeting the challenge of modern warfare." He proposed that the Senate Armed Services Committee study the possibility of eliminating the services, as such, and regrouping them into a retaliatory striking force, a limited war force, a continental defense command and a logistic command.

- The House Government Operations Committee, in a report filed Sept. 2, called for an Army-Air Force merger to eliminate duplication and waste in the missile field, short of which "the Nation will be exposed to the vitiating effects of interservice jealousies, rivalries and wars for many years to come."

Defense Funds

As usual, the House and Senate took markedly different views toward the President's request for \$39,248,200,000 to run the Defense Department in fiscal 1960. (Military construction funds were considered separately). When the appropriation bill finally emerged, however, it was a bare \$20 million below the budget estimate.

The House Appropriations Committee started off by cutting \$1.2 billion from certain programs, then adding \$800 million to others, for a net reduction of \$400 million. Among the cuts in the measure reported May 28: the entire \$260 million requested for a conventionally powered aircraft carrier, and nearly \$500 million for various Air Force programs, including the controversial BOMARC missile. Major additions made by the Committee included \$200 million for Army procurement, \$255 million for anti-submarine warfare programs, and \$172 million for the ATLAS and MINUTEMAN ballistic missiles. The House passed the bill June 3 without change, by a 392-3 vote.

The Senate Appropriations Committee proceeded to add \$746 million to the bill, including another \$200 million for Army procurement and \$380 million for a second nuclear-powered carrier sought by the Navy (rather than the conventionally powered unit approved by the Defense Department). As reported July 7, the bill also restored one-half of the cut ordered by the House in BOMARC funds.

When the bill reached the Senate July 13, Sen. Symington offered an amendment to increase Army procurement funds by still another \$234 million, to a total just under \$1.7 billion. But the move was rejected by a 43-48 vote. (See Senate Roll Call No. 9, p. 31). The Senate then passed the bill July 14, with no change in its money provisions.

Senate and House conferees compromised their differences over the Navy's carrier by allowing \$35 million for advance planning and procurement for a nuclear-powered unit. As approved Aug. 4 by both chambers, the bill provided \$39,228,239,000 to finance the Defense Department in fiscal 1960, or about \$20 million less than requested.

The Department fared less well on its separate request for \$1,563,200,000 for military construction projects. As finally approved Sept. 4 by Senate and House, this money bill carried \$200 million less than requested. Of greater significance, however, was a new provision inserted earlier in the annual authorization measure, sent to the President on July 30. This proviso, originally added by the Senate Armed Services Committee, stipulated that after Dec. 31, 1960 all appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels must be authorized specifically by legislation enacted after that date. This meant that, beginning in 1961, more than one-fourth of the Defense Department's budget would be subjected to annual scrutiny by the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, as well as by the two Appropriations Committees.

Military Manpower

At Administration request, Congress extended the draft law, due to expire June 30, for another four years. Defense Department officials argued that the authority to draft men, although used only by the Army, was needed by all of the services as a prod to voluntary enlistment. Without the draft, they said, the services would fall 700,000 short of the 2.5 million men needed.

The House disposed of the bill Feb. 5 with little debate, rejecting motions to recommit the bill and to limit the extension to two years. The measure was passed by a 381-20 vote. The Senate likewise rejected, by a 24-67 vote, an effort by Sen. Wayne Morse (D Ore.) to limit the extension to two years. An amendment by Sen. Francis Case (R S.D.) to set up a Commission on Military Manpower, with orders to report in two years, was also rejected, 24-68. The Senate then passed the bill March 11, 90-1, with Sen. William Langer (R N.D.) alone voting "nay."

As sent to the President March 12, the measure extended until July 1, 1963 the induction provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950; authority to draft physicians, dentists and allied specialists; and authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists and veterinarians entering active duty.

In separate action, Congress completed action July 6 on a bill extending for four years the program under which men between 17 and 18½ may enlist for six months of active military service, to be followed by seven and one-half years in the active reserve program.

Atomic Exchange

Equally little protest was voiced in Congress to the President's proposals for exchanging atomic weapons data with seven NATO allies. Authority for the exchange was embodied in amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, approved by Congress in 1958 after considerable debate and with the proviso that all exchange agreements be subject to disapproval by resolution of Congress.

Rep. William H. Meyer (D Vt.) and six other Democrats introduced resolutions of disapproval on grounds that the agreements would lead to the "proliferation" of nuclear weapons. But the powerful Joint Atomic Energy Committee rejected this view and July 15 filed a report approving the agreements. These provided for transferring to Britain certain non-nuclear parts for nuclear weapons, and for exchanging uranium 235 for plutonium; for selling to France uranium fuel to power a submarine reactor; and for giving Canada, the Netherlands, Turkey, Greece and West Germany certain information for the development of defense plans and for training personnel in the handling of atomic weapons and weapons systems.

Space Agency

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, created in 1958 in response to the shock administered by the first Soviet "sputnik" on Oct. 4, 1957, continued to enjoy a relatively untroubled honeymoon with Congress in 1959. The House Science and Astronautics Committee and the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, set up to keep tabs on NASA, insisted on retaining their right to authorize annual appropriations for the agency, but made no trouble over funds for fiscal 1960. NASA was voted \$500 million in a supplemental bill approved Aug. 19 by both chambers.

There were signs of darker days ahead, however. The legislators, concerned over relations between civilian and military space programs, were unable to draw any information from NASA Administrator T. Keith Glennan on policy decisions of the National Space Council, chaired by the President. In a report issued July 18, a Senate Space subcommittee said the U.S. space effort was being handicapped by the Administration's failure to develop a comprehensive, long-range civilian-military space program and by inadequate coordination of NASA's work with that of the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Glennan, in a speech Aug. 24, acknowledged that "we are not nearly as far advanced in space technology as we had thought or hoped." And he added: "We should admit, quite frankly, that with distressingly few exceptions, we have not achieved complete success in any mission to date."

The harshness of Glennan's appraisal took on added meaning when, on the eve of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United States, the Soviets Sept. 12 launched a missile which 34 hours later hit the moon. "An impressive feat," said Glennan.

Radiation Hazards

Continuation of the suspension of nuclear weapons tests by the U.S., U.K., and U.S.S.R., pending the outcome of negotiations for a permanent ban, helped to minimize Congressional concern over radiation hazards, present and future. Hearings before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee underscored the continuing controversy among scientists concerning the precise nature and scope of the fallout problem; on the whole, however, they tended to down-grade earlier conceptions of the hazards to health flowing from weapons tests to date.

One by-product of the scientific controversy was a proposal to transfer responsibility for setting and enforcing minimum radiation safety standards from the Atomic Energy Commission to the U.S. Public Health Service. A bill to this effect received hearings in the Senate, but got no further action. A partial step in this direction was taken, however, when President Eisenhower Aug. 14 established a Federal

Radiation Council by executive order, and in the process gave the Public Health Service an enlarged role in the field.

Even more remote from the mainstream of Congressional concern in 1959 was the question of nuclear war and its potential effects on the United States. On the basis of a careful analysis of the biological and environmental effects of a hypothetical all-out attack on the U.S., the Joint Atomic Energy Radiation Subcommittee concluded Aug. 31 that approximately 50 million Americans would die immediately or soon thereafter. The report then stated:

"Probably the most significant finding presented to the subcommittee was that civil defense preparedness could reduce the casualties of the assumed attack on the United States from approximately 30 percent of the population to about 3 percent." The cost of adequate shelter protection for the nation was estimated at between \$5 billion and \$20 billion.

The Governors' Conference earlier had endorsed a sharp step-up in state efforts to deal with the civil defense problem, but in Washington the House cut from \$25 million to \$10 million a fund for providing assistance to the states on civil defense matters. Congress, long dissatisfied with the Federal civil defense program, was not yet ready to undertake any massive effort to meet what most Members regarded as a remote contingency.

Munitions Lobby

The sharp fight over defense funds in 1959 not only confirmed Congress in its suspicion that interservice rivalry remained as prevalent as ever. It also served to spotlight the promotional activities of defense contractors in behalf of their products, and to raise questions regarding the role of retired military personnel on their payrolls.

On July 7 a House Armed Services subcommittee headed by Rep. F. Edward Hébert (D La.) opened hearings on possible conflicts of interest involved in the employment of retired officers by firms competing for defense contracts. A parade of retired generals and admirals appeared before the committee to deny that retired officers could exert any influence over procurement policies. Several, however, endorsed the idea of a two or three-year "cooling-off" period during which ex-officers would be barred from contract negotiations with the armed services.

The Hébert probe got on livelier ground when it turned up the fact that full-page newspaper advertisements extolling the virtues of the Army's Nike-Hercules missile, published during Congressional debate over funds for the program, had been inserted by the missile's builder, Western Electric Co., at the suggestion of Army officials. The committee also learned that the Martin Aircraft Co. had often flown high-ranking military officers to the Bahamas for weekend parties. Further sidelights on the ins and outs of service-contractor relationships were in store as the committee continued its investigation.

President Scored on "Strong" Labor Reform Bill

Working under some of the most intense pressures felt on Capitol Hill in years, Congress, in the waning days of the 1959 session, passed a "strong" labor reform bill containing major Taft-Hartley Act amendments favored by business and opposed by organized labor.

The final version of the bill represented a personal triumph for President Eisenhower and testified to the legislative skill of House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck of Indiana. It was Halleck who had been largely responsible for constructing the coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats which overcame the powerful influence of Speaker Sam Rayburn and the clear preference of Senate Democrats for a milder bill.

The continuing exposure of union corruption and labor-management collusion by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field had produced a deluge of letters, telegrams and editorials calling for action. The build-up was capped Aug. 6, on the eve of House debate on the labor measure, when the Committee issued a report summarizing its three years of investigations under the leadership of Sen. John L. McClellan (D Ark.).

Kennedy Bill: The initial version of the reform bill came to the Senate floor April 15 bearing the imprint of a "moderate" approach favored by its sponsor, Sen. John F. Kennedy (D Mass.), and most Northern Democrats. It even had the endorsement of the AFL-CIO. The Kennedy bill depended mainly on exposure to fight corruption; it intended only a minimal interference in union internal affairs. The measure differed little from the bill passed by the Senate in 1958 after long and bitter debate, only to be killed by the House.

Sen. Kennedy's bill required unions and union officials to furnish annual reports to the Secretary of Labor on a wide variety of financial matters and employers to report annually on money spent to influence unions, either directly or through management middlemen. It also set minimum standards for union trusteeships over locals and for democratic union elections; sought to bar hoodlum elements from union office; and outlawed labor-management bribes and payoffs.

In addition, the bill contained three so-called "sweeteners" aimed at making it more acceptable to the unions: one, permitting strikers fired while on strike to vote in NLRB representation elections at the struck firm even though not entitled to reinstatement; two, allowing firms and unions in the building trades to sign collective bargaining agreements before beginning a job; and three, removing telephone

switchboard supervisors from the category of "supervisors" under Taft-Hartley, thus making them subject to union-shop contract negotiations. The first two provisions were favored by President Eisenhower and became part of the final bill. The third did not survive.

However, the President had also asked for Taft-Hartley amendments involving secondary boycotts, the "no man's land" gap, organizational and recognition picketing and hot cargo contracts. These were omitted from the Kennedy bill and became the focus of dispute in both House and Senate.

Senate Action: The Senate passed the Kennedy bill (S 1555) April 25 on a 90-1 roll-call vote, with Sen. Barry Goldwater (R Ariz.) the lone dissenter. But this one-sided vote followed the longest debate of the session, requiring votes on 55 separate amendments, 16 by roll call. Although none of the President's Taft-Hartley requests was inserted, the bill was toughened enough to make the AFL-CIO withdraw its endorsement.

Sen. McClellan offered a key amendment designed to cure the "no man's land" problem by allowing state courts and labor relations agencies to assume control of labor disputes technically under Federal law but considered too minor by the NLRB to warrant the time and expense of adjudication. Labor feared this solution would bring a spate of anti-labor injunctions in state courts. The proposal was defeated, 39-52. (See Senate Roll Call No. 4, p. 30.)

So was McClellan's amendment to extend secondary boycott prohibitions to include airline, railroad, farm, domestic and government workers, and to bar unions from threatening an employer to make him quit doing business with a primary firm. This was defeated, 41-50. (See Senate Roll Call No. 5, p. 30.)

McClellan scored a victory, however, when the Senate voted, 47-46, to attach his "Bill of Rights" for labor to the Kennedy measure. (See Senate Roll Call No. 3, p. 30.) Among the rights guaranteed to union members: to vote in union elections, nominate candidates, speak at union meetings, and participate in union business. There were also guarantees against arbitrary fines and punishments and against reprisals for opposition to union officers or testimony about them in court. Violation of any of these rights was made a criminal offense.

Subsequently, the "bill of rights" was itself amended to delete an enforcement provision giving the Secretary of Labor power to enjoin violation of a member's rights. This power paralleled an element in one of the civil rights bills opposed by Southerners. Similarly, the "Bill of Rights" was clarified to

indicate that there was no intention of forcing social integration on the unions.

House Action: When S 1555 reached the House, the Education and Labor Committee appeared to be closely divided between Northern Democrats who thought it "punitive" and Southern Democrats and Republicans who thought it too weak. There was some question whether the committee would report any bill. However, public pressure, catalyzed by business lobbying and the President's repeated calls for action, proved irresistible.

The Committee's clean bill, reported July 30, closely paralleled the Senate version. However, it was clear that it did not have a majority and had been reported out only for the sake of getting some sort of measure on to the floor. Ten separate groupings of opinion were to be found in the committee's report. The six Republicans who voted for the committee bill along with 10 Democrats all said they hoped to see it strengthened on the floor. Ten Democrats and four Republicans opposed the bill altogether. In fact, of the 30 members, only five gave the bill wholehearted endorsement.

Coincidentally with the reporting of the committee measure, two substitute bills were introduced. Reps. Phil M. Landrum (D Ga.) and Robert P. Griffin (R Mich.) offered a "tough" bill (HR 8400), while Rep. John F. Shelley (D Calif.), former president of the California Federation of Labor, proposed a measure (HR 8490) similar to the original Kennedy bill before its amendment by the Senate. In its handling of the anti-corruption issue, the Landrum-Griffin bill closely paralleled the committee measure. In addition, it incorporated all of the Taft-Hartley changes sought by the President. This substitute was promptly endorsed by the President, Sen. McClellan and House GOP leaders. The Shelley bill won the backing of 43 House Democrats and the AFL-CIO.

In the power struggle which followed, most of the major labor organizations, business groups like the National Assn. of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., and such key Administration leaders as Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and Attorney General William P. Rogers were all immensely active. Some unions, notably the Teamsters and John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers, were opposed to any bill.

The attempt to substitute the Shelley bill for the Committee bill was quickly beaten on a 132-245 teller vote, as was a civil rights amendment offered by Rep. Adam Clayton Powell Jr. (D N.Y.) The key roll call came late Aug. 13 on the Landrum-Griffin substitute. It won, 229-201, in the largest total vote ever recorded in the House. (See House Roll Call No. 5, p. 26) The rejection the following day of a recommittal motion, 148-280, was purely a formality and the bill was sped to conference, 303-125 (see House Roll Call No. 6, p. 26).

After 12 days of protracted bargaining, the conference committee came up with a compromise which

was essentially the House bill with exemptions from the bans on picketing and hot cargo contracts. The Senate agreed to the conference version, 95-2, with Sens. Wayne Morse (D Ore.) and William Langer (R N.D.) the two dissenters. The House gave its approval Sept. 4, 352-52, sending the bill to the President.

Provisions: The final version included the McClellan "Bill of Rights," the original anti-corruption, fair election and trusteeship guarantees of the Kennedy bill and these major Taft-Hartley changes:

- State labor relations agencies and courts were given the power to handle "no man's land" cases, applying state labor law.

- Threatening an employer to make him quit doing business with a struck firm was made an unfair labor practice for unions, as was inducing a supervisor, or a worker acting alone, to refuse to handle struck goods for the same purpose. It was specified, however, that union inducement of workers to refuse to handle work "farmed out" from a struck firm was not considered a secondary boycott.

- Hot cargo contracts, in which employers agree not to do business with firms labeled "unfair" by the union, were made illegal. But garment industry contracts barring jobbers from subcontracting single garments to non-union shops and construction industry contracts barring job-site subcontracting to non-union firms were both exempted.

- Organizational and recognition picketing were forbidden where the picketing union or any other union had lost an NLRB certification election within the previous year (provided the defeat was not attributable to an unfair labor practice by the employer) and also where another union had already been recognized (provided again that no unfair labor practice was involved).

- Organizational and recognition picketing in excess of 30 days without calling a representation election was barred, except that "informational" picketing could be continued for another 30 days if it did not lead to work stoppages or interfere with normal pickup and delivery service.

- Airline, railroad, farm and government workers were brought under the Taft-Hartley ban against secondary boycotts and recognition and organizational picketing.

- Strikers fired during a strike and not entitled to reinstatement were allowed to vote in representation elections conducted by the NLRB within a year after the strike's start.

- Unions were forbidden to picket retail stores to advertise that goods from a struck firm were being sold there.

Civil Rights

Civil rights proponents worked unavailingly in 1959 to bring substantive legislation to the House or Senate floor. In the end, all that was achieved was a two-year extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Even that measure, offered at the last minute as a rider to the foreign aid bill, produced a flurry of Southern opposition before being approved by the Senate, by a vote of 71-18. (See Senate Roll Call No. 16, p. 32.)

Three groups were involved in the 1959 maneuvering over civil rights: a bipartisan group of Northern liberals, the moderate forces drawn to the proposals of the Eisenhower Administration and of Senate Majority Leader Johnson, and Southern Democrats opposed to any and all forms of civil rights laws.

On Jan. 20 Johnson introduced his bill (S 499) to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, strengthen penalties against bombings, give the Justice Department subpoena powers in its investigations of voting right cases, and establish a new Federal Community Relations Service to assist in the conciliation of disputes over segregation.

The President submitted his seven-point program Feb. 5. Like the Johnson proposal, it included provisions to continue the Civil Rights Commission, strengthen anti-bombing sanctions, and empower the Justice Department to inspect voting records. In place of Johnson's conciliation service, it offered limited technical and financial aid to areas facing school-desegregation problems.

The President also asked Congress to make mob interference with school integration orders a Federal crime, to provide emergency schooling for children of armed forces personnel whose schools were closed by integration disputes, and to grant statutory authority to his Committee on Government Contracts, which seeks to eliminate discrimination in private employment.

The measures offered by the liberal bloc (S 810, HR 3147) went beyond the other proposals in one major respect -- empowering the Attorney General to file civil suits on his own initiative to end segregation in schools and to secure other rights outside the voting field. The Administration had sought this so-called Section 3 authority in 1957, when it was rejected by the Senate, but it opposed inclusion of the provision in any 1959 bill.

The liberals, led by Rep. Emanuel Celler (D N.Y.), pushed their bill through a House Judiciary subcommittee June 17. But before reporting it Aug. 6, the full Judiciary Committee stripped it of its Section 3 provision and its provisions for giving technical aid to school districts and statutory authority to the Government Contracts Committee. This pared-down measure was then pigeonholed by the Rules Committee.

Across the Capitol, a "skeleton" bill was approved July 15 by a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, after lengthy hearings. Its sole provisions extended

the life of the Civil Rights Commission and required the preservation of voting records. Even this was too much for the full Judiciary Committee, chaired by Sen. James O. Eastland (D Miss.), and remained on ice until adjournment.

All of these measures carry over to 1960, along with some new proposals -- notably that made by the Civil Rights Commission, in its report of Sept. 8, that Federal registrars be appointed to serve temporarily in areas where state officials refuse to permit Negroes to vote. An early debate was assured when Senate leaders agreed to schedule consideration of a civil rights bill around Feb. 15, 1960.

"Court Bills"

Critics of a series of Supreme Court decisions involving civil liberties renewed their drive in 1959 to enact overruling legislation, but met with no greater success than in 1958. As before, the House passed a number of "court bills" but the Senate failed to act. Enthusiasm for putting the Court in its place had slackened noticeably.

Granddaddy of all the measures was HR 3, introduced by Rep. Howard W. Smith (D Va.). Widely described as a "states rights" measure, it provided that Federal courts could not construe acts of Congress as being intended to preempt the field to the exclusion of state laws on the same subjects, unless Congress had so specified or there was a direct conflict between the Federal and state laws.

Proponents of the bill, reported June 2 by the House Judiciary Committee, argued that it was not meant to permit states to nullify Federal law but only to permit them to protect their citizens in certain twilight areas of Federal-state law. The bill's opponents countered that it would unsettle a century of established precedents and invite endless litigation.

All efforts to amend HR 3 on the House floor were defeated, and the measure was passed June 24 by a 225-192 margin, with most Republicans in favor and most Democrats opposed. (See House Roll Call No. 4, p. 26) But the bill never emerged from the Senate Judiciary Committee, possibly because its backers achieved their principal objective in the "no man's land" provision of the labor reform bill (see p. 18).

Passports: In 1958 the Supreme Court held, in the Kent case, that Congress had never given the State Department authority to deny passports to Americans solely because of their "beliefs or associations," including membership in the Communist Party. The House passed a remedial bill, but the Senate didn't. In 1959, the Administration was itself less insistent on getting new legislation. The House, nevertheless, passed a measure (HR 9069) Sept. 8, giving the Secretary of State power to deny passports to Communists or Communist-sympathizers whose presence abroad might endanger U.S. security. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, however, decided to postpone action on a passport bill until 1960.

Mallory Rule: In the 1957 Mallory case, the Court ruled that a confession obtained between arrest and arraignment was invalid if there had been delay in arraignment. The House July 7 voted 262-138 to pass a bill (HR 4957) providing that a confession obtained from a criminal suspect could not be barred as Federal court evidence solely because of delay in arraigning the suspect. The Senate took no action.

Yates Case: In this 1957 decision the Court, holding to a narrow construction of the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act, struck down convictions of several Communist Party leaders. As in 1958, the House March 2 passed a bill (HR 2369) making it clear that the Smith Act's prohibitions against organizing a group advocating the forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government extended to such continuing activities as the recruitment of members, as well as the initial act of organization. The Senate took no action.

Industrial Security: On June 29, 1959, in the Greene case, the Supreme Court voided the Government's industrial security program, used to screen out "security risks" in private defense plants, on grounds that neither the President nor Congress had authorized a program in which an employee could be denied access to classified information when he "was not afforded the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination." The House Un-American Activities Committee Sept. 2 reported a bill to remedy the situation, but it never reached the floor.

Antitrust

An antitrust measure sought by the President for four years was finally sent to him July 13 when Congress completed action on S 726 amending the Clayton Act. It made cease-and-desist orders of the Federal Trade Commission final, without court enforcement orders, unless appealed to the courts within 60 days. But Congress took no action on the Administration's major antitrust request -- a pre-merger notification law giving the Justice Department power to review proposed mergers involving companies with \$10 million or more in capital.

Two other antitrust measures were passed by the Senate but not the House. S 716, also requested by the President, would authorize the Attorney General to compel any business to produce documentary evidence for examination in a civil antitrust investigation. S 1062, passed May 14, was designed to strengthen Federal regulation of bank mergers; it was opposed by the Justice Department, however, as being inadequate.

The House interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee June 9 reported a "fair trade" bill (HR 1253) that would permit manufacturers to sue in Federal court to enforce stipulated prices. And in the Senate the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee Sept. 3 approved a bill (S 2545) to exempt some of the practices of professional football, basketball, and hockey teams from the antitrust laws. Neither of these measures reached the floor.

Miscellany

Renegotiation: The Renegotiation Act of 1951, enacted during the Korean war to enable the Defense Department to recapture excessive profits on defense contracts, was extended for only six months in 1958, until June 30, 1959, to permit a broad study of the law. None was made, however, and on May 27 the House passed a bill (HR 7086) extending the Act for four years. The Senate voted June 23 for a three-year extension, which was the term provided in the bill sent to the President July 1.

Reorganization: Congress administered two rebuffs to the President in connection with the Reorganization Act of 1949, authorizing him to reorganize executive agencies, subject to the veto of either Senate or House. First, the House, by a 266-124 vote July 7, adopted a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, shifting certain functions from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture. Second, the Senate failed to act on a bill (HR 5140) passed by the House June 2, extending the basic Act for another two years. So the legislation lapsed on June 1.

Equal Time: In a 4-3 ruling Feb. 19, the Federal Communications Commission held that Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, requiring broadcasters to give "equal time" to all political candidates, extended to regular newscasts. The ruling brought a storm of protest; President Eisenhower called it "ridiculous" and Congress set about re-writing Section 315. As sent to the President Sept. 3, the bill (S 2424) exempted from the "equal time" requirement appearances by legally qualified candidates on a bona fide newscast, interview or documentary, or on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events, including political conventions.

Obscene Mail: At the request of the Post Office Department, the House Sept. 1 passed a bill (HR 7379) to extend from 20 days to 45 days the time during which the Department may impound mail received by persons who send obscene or fraudulent matter through the mails. The Senate took no action.

Federal Reserve: Congress July 15 completed work on a bill (S 1120) authorizing the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to permit member banks to "count all or part of their currency and coin as reserves." The effect of adding this so-called vault cash, amounting to an estimated \$2 billion, to member bank reserves was to permit a substantial expansion of the banks' lending power.

Bank Powers: In separate action, Congress also sent the President, Aug. 26, a bill (HR 8160) increasing the ceiling on a national bank's borrowing authority from 100 percent of capital to 100 percent of capital plus 50 percent of surplus. The bill contained several other provisions, most of which were drawn from the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, an omnibus measure that passed the Senate but died in the House.

General Government

The United States of America - Now 50 Strong

Nothing accomplished by the 86th Congress in 1959 was likely to prove so enduring as its decision to confer statehood on a volcanic group of 20 Pacific Ocean islands lying more than 2,000 miles west of San Francisco. After 59 years of tutelage, the territory of Hawaii was finally joined to the Union as the 50th state.

Statehood for the one-time kingdom had proved an elusive goal for a decade, until the 85th Congress voted in 1958 to admit the territory of Alaska as the 49th state. Aspirations of the two non-contiguous territories had become interdependent, as Congressmen opposed to the claims of one or the other made common cause in their efforts to bottle up the necessary enabling legislation.

Opposition to statehood focused on the power wielded in the islands by Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, expelled from the CIO in 1950 for alleged Communist domination. (The union has 25,000 members in Hawaii, 90 percent of whom work on sugar and pineapple plantations.) Hawaii's great distance from the mainland, together with the fact that only 23 percent of its 1950 population was of Caucasian origin, also served to buttress opposition to statehood. Perhaps the most effective argument against statehood, both for Hawaii and for Alaska, came from Southern Democrats who feared that their strength on key civil rights issues would be diluted with the advent of four additional Senators from the West.

With the backing of Democratic and Republican leaders, proponents of statehood finally overcame the Southerners in 1958, to admit Alaska. Nearly identical bills to admit Hawaii were reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Feb. 11, 1959, and by its Senate counterpart March 5. The Senate took only a few hours to dispose of its bill, S 50, on March 11. A motion by Sen. Strom Thurmond (D S.C.) to recommit the bill, with instructions to report back a commonwealth measure, was rejected by voice vote. The Senate then passed S 50, by a 76-15 vote. (See Senate Roll Call No. 2, p. 30) Next day the House acted with equal dispatch, first rejecting a motion to recommit, then passing S 50 by a 323-89 vote. (See House Roll Call No. 1, p. 26) President Eisenhower signed the bill into law (P.L. 3) on March 18.

In accordance with the enabling act, Hawaii held both a primary election and a referendum on June 27, at which statehood was endorsed by a 17-to-1 margin. In the general election held July 28 the voters elected Republican William F. Quinn as Governor of the new state. To represent them in Congress, they chose Oren E. Long (D) and Hiram L. Fong (R) as Senators, and Daniel K. Inouye (D) as Representative.

On Aug. 21 the President signed the proclamation formally admitting Hawaii to the Union, and on Aug. 24 the new state's Congressional delegation was sworn in. Underscoring the historic nature of the ceremony was the fact that Sen. Fong, of Chinese origin, and Rep. Inouye, of Japanese origin, became the first persons of Oriental ancestry to take seats as Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Government Relations

Congress showed no greater interest in 1959 than it had in 1958 in the President's proposal that the Federal Government make a start on transferring responsibility to the states for certain grant programs, beginning with water pollution control. Indeed, Democrats very nearly succeeded in doubling the size of that program. (See p. 8.) In other respects, however, the legislators demonstrated awareness of the need for resolving some of the complexities of inter-governmental relations.

The House Aug. 17 and the Senate Sept. 10 passed different versions of a bill (HR 6904) to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. As finally approved Sept. 12, the measure provided for a permanent, bipartisan body to be composed of 26 members, to include six Members of Congress, four Governors, four mayors, three state legislators, three county officials, three Federal officials, and three private citizens. The Commission was directed to file an annual report on its activities.

Behind this action was the fact that mayors and other local officials resented their lack of representation on the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, established at the President's suggestion in 1957 and composed exclusively of Governors and Federal officials.

To deal specifically with a demand from the U.S. Council of Mayors for attention to the growing problems of metropolitan areas, the Senate Sept. 10 passed a bill (S 1431) to establish a 21-member Commission on Metropolitan Problems to study Federal policies and programs "relating to the needs" of metropolitan areas. A similar bill was reported in the House; neither measure received final action before adjournment, however.

Congress did complete action Sept. 11 on a bill (S 2568) requested by the President, authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into agreements with the states to turn over certain responsibilities for regulating the handling of such materials as radioisotopes. AEC was authorized to train state health and safety officials for the purpose.

Nominations

In a session overrun with partisan issues, none was so long or bitterly debated as President Eisenhower's choice of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. Given an interim appointment Nov. 13, 1958 after completing a five-year term as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Strauss came under heavy and mounting criticism from Democrats from the moment his nomination came before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In the course of hearings stretching from March 17 to May 14, Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.) and other Democrats accused the nominee of having withheld vital information on several occasions from the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, having distorted his own role in the fabled Dixon-Yates affair and other policy disputes, and having evaded the questions of his Congressional inquisitors.

When the nomination was finally put to a vote, the Commerce Committee divided 9-to-8 in favor of confirmation. The majority extolled Strauss, the minority condemned him for conduct "lacking in the degree of integrity and competence essential to proper performance" of his duties as Secretary of Commerce. With pro- and anti-Strauss forces exerting unprecedented pressures on uncommitted Senators, the nomination moved to the floor for a showdown.

When it came June 19, with only three of the 98 Senators not voting, the nomination was rejected, 46-49. (See Senate Roll Call No. 6, p. 30.) With the help of two Republicans -- William Langer (N.D.) and Margaret Chase Smith (Maine) -- Majority Leader Johnson and 46 other Democrats had administered the first veto of a major Eisenhower appointment in six years -- and the first rejection of a Cabinet nomination since 1925. Strauss resigned June 30; Under Secretary Frederick H. Mueller was promptly confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

Three other Eisenhower appointees won Senate confirmation over minority opposition:

- Potter Stewart, given a recess appointment Oct. 7, 1958 as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, provoked Southern Democrats by endorsing the Court's 1954 desegregation ruling, but on May 5 the Senate voted 70-17 to confirm his nomination.

- Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, named Feb. 26 to be Ambassador to Brazil, won confirmation April 28 by a 79-11 vote, but promptly booted it by telling an interviewer: "My difficulties, of course, go back some years when Sen. Wayne Morse (D Ore.) was kicked in the head by a horse." This affront to Senatorial dignity was not to be appeased; having let the cat out of the bag, so to speak, Mrs. Luce resigned May 1.

- Ogden R. Reid, nominated March 10 as Ambassador to Israel, ran into stiff opposition from Chairman J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who challenged the 33-year-old editor's qualifications for the job. But Reid's appointment was confirmed June 4 by voice vote.

President vs. Congress

Highlighting the policy clash between the Chief Executive and the legislative branch in 1959 were a series of Presidential vetoes and attempts by Congress to override. By adjournment, the President had vetoed 10 bills, including two housing measures (see p. 6), three farm bills (see p. 10), and two public works bills (see p. 11). Of the five attempts to override, only the final one succeeded. Passage of the second public works bill over the President's veto gave Congress its first such victory in the Eisenhower era.

Less dramatic, but no less important, were two other disputes involving the knotty issue of the separation of powers. One concerned fiscal controls, the other the question of executive privilege.

In passing a TVA self-financing measure, Congress attached a provision giving itself the power to alter TVA's power construction program by concurrent resolution, not subject to veto. (See p. 5) The President said this would allow Congress to "modify the Authority's program without regard to the views of the President and without opportunity for the President to exercise his constitutional role in the legislative process." He insisted that the provision be deleted; Congress quickly complied.

The second dispute was provoked by provisions inserted by Congress in mutual security legislation requiring the President to make certain information public. In signing the authorization bill July 24, he noted that it was "on the express premise that the three amendments relating to disclosure are not intended to alter and cannot alter the recognized constitutional duty and power of the Executive with respect to the disclosure of information, documents and other materials." Any other construction, he said, "would raise grave constitutional questions under the historic separation of powers doctrine."

Five days later, the House added to the foreign aid appropriation bill a provision to prohibit expenditures if the International Cooperation Administration failed to furnish Congress information within 20 days of its request. This was watered down by the Senate, and the final provision, giving ICA 35 days to comply, included a large loophole. If he didn't wish to comply, the President could certify that he had forbidden the disclosure, giving his reason for doing so.

Secrecy in the Executive Branch continued to draw Congressional fire, however. In a Sept. 3 report covering 35 investigations of complaints against secrecy, the House Government Operations Committee said that claims of executive privilege were being raised "by subordinate Federal officials more and more frequently" to avoid disclosing information. Of the Defense Department, the report said: "To an alarming degree, the Pentagon's information organization has assumed characteristics of a propaganda ministry, and confusion has replaced candor in areas of vital importance" to the Nation.

Miscellany

Government Employees: The only measure of wide interest to Federal employees to be sent to the President in 1959 was a bill (S 2162) cleared Sept. 14 establishing a prepaid, voluntary health insurance program for Federal workers and their families, with the Government paying one-half of the annual cost.

Home Rule: The long struggle to gain home rule for the District of Columbia continued in 1959. The Senate July 15 passed a bill (S 1681) giving the District the right to elect a mayor, city council, and non-voting delegate to the House -- the fifth such measure to clear the Senate since 1949. But Southern opponents successfully bottled up S 1681 and other bills in the House District Committee.

Third Term: A proposal to repeal the 22nd Amendment, limiting U.S. Presidents to two terms in office, brought comments from the incumbent and his predecessor. Former President Truman said he had "never thought well" of the Amendment, while President Eisenhower called it "unwise." But Attorney General William P. Rogers opposed its repeal, and no action was taken.

Poll Tax: Sen. Spessard L. Holland (D Fla.) and 66 co-sponsors introduced a proposed Constitutional amendment Aug. 6 (S J Res 126) to ban the poll tax -- levied in five Southern states -- as a requirement in elections for Federal office. Endorsed five times by the House but never by the Senate, the proposal received no further notice.

Judgeships: The Senate Judiciary Committee Sept. 10 reported a bill to create 25 new Federal judgeships, but the bill never reached the floor.

Senate Rules

Northern liberals were defeated in the opening days of the 1959 session in their efforts to substantially overhaul the filibuster rule of the Senate. The 10-year-old Rule 22 required the vote of two-thirds of the entire Senate membership to shut off debate. It also said debate could not be shut off on proposals to consider changes in Senate rules.

Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson seized the initiative from the liberal bloc in the first minutes of the session by offering a resolution (S Res 5) revising Rule 22 to enable a two-thirds majority of Senators present and voting to shut off debate on any measure, including proposed rule changes.

Liberals countered with a motion -- defeated in 1953 and 1957 -- that the Senate proceed to consider the adoption of new rules. Acceptance of the motion would then have permitted a simple majority of the Senate to change Rule 22. Johnson blocked consideration of the motion, made by Sen. Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.), until Jan. 9, when he moved to table it. The Senate, knowing that Democratic and Republican leaders had agreed to the modest change embodied in S Res 5, voted to table the Anderson motion, 60-36. (See Senate Roll Call No. 1, p. 30.)

Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D Ill.) then offered a substitute for S Res 5, to enable a majority of the Senate membership to shut off debate 15 days after 16 Senators filed a cloture motion. The Douglas amendment was rejected, 28-67, and the Senate on Jan. 12 voted 72-22 to adopt S Res 5. Chief lesson of the debate and its outcome seemed to be that Sen. Johnson was indeed a skilled leader and parliamentarian.

Summary of 28 Key Votes In Senate and House

Legislation is passed or defeated by Congress in several ways -- by unanimous consent, voice vote, teller vote, division or standing vote, and roll-call vote. Only by the roll-call vote is it possible to establish beyond question the public record of a Member on the issues. The first session of the 86th Congress put an unusually high number of questions to the test of a roll-call vote: 215 in the Senate, 87 in the House. From this number Congressional Quarterly selected 28 as Key Votes -- 12 in the House and 16 in the Senate. The stand taken by each Member on these votes is recorded in the charts beginning on page 26. Below are brief summaries of the issues at stake in the 28 Key Votes.

House

1. The territory of Hawaii surmounted the last obstacle to statehood when the House, with unaccustomed dispatch, approved within 24 hours a Senate-passed bill to admit the island paradise as the 50th state, by a 323-89 margin. (See story, p. 22)

2. A hoary dispute between public- and private-power advocates began to approach resolution when the House, by a 245-170 vote, passed a bill authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds to finance new power facilities. (See story, p. 5)

3. The annual struggle over the Mutual Security Program reached its first climax when the House, by

a vote of 271-142, passed a \$3.5 billion authorization measure after cutting the President's request by almost 10 percent. (See story, p. 12)

4. Over Justice Department opposition, Southern Democrats and most Republicans combined forces to pass, 225-192, a far-reaching bill to nullify the doctrine of Federal preemption in fields of concurrent Federal-state jurisdiction. (See story, p. 20)

5. In many eyes, the single most important vote of the 1959 session came when the House, given the choice of two labor reform measures, picked the tougher one by a close but comfortable margin, 229-201. (See story, p. 18)

6. Having voted to substitute the stiff Landrum-Griffin bill for a weaker committee measure, the House proceeded to pass the former by a top-heavy majority, 303-125, despite the overwhelming opposition of organized labor. (See story, p. 18)

7. A minor bill aimed at Secretary Benson assumed new significance when the President vetoed it and the House, in its first attempt of the session to override, fell four votes shy of a two-thirds majority on a 280-146 ballot. (See story, p. 10)

8. Four months later, the House again failed to override a veto, this time of a catch-all public works bill. The 274-138 vote was only one "yea" short of the required margin -- a result made possible by several switches. (See story, p. 11)

9. When a second version of the public works bill was also vetoed, insult was added to injury. With a dozen votes to spare, the House, for the first time in the Eisenhower Administration, passed the measure over the veto, 280-121. (See story, p. 11)

10. After President Eisenhower vetoed the first housing bill, the Senate drafted another measure that met some, but not all, of his objections. This bill, also fated to be vetoed, was passed by the House, 283-105. (See story, p. 6)

11. A long wrangle between Democrats and the President over a crisis in highway finances was ended when the House, by a 243-162 vote, passed the bill raising the Federal tax on gasoline from 3 cents to 4 cents per gallon. (See story, p. 2)

12. An equally partisan and heated dispute over interest rates was extended into 1960 when the House refused, 134-255, to give the President authority to lift the interest ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds. (See story, p. 4)

Senate

1. A renewed effort by Senate liberals to revise the filibuster rule was effectively thwarted when Sen. Johnson, displaying his usual parliamentary skill, persuaded the Senate to vote 60-36 to table the key liberal motion. (See story, p. 24)

2. One of the few policy objectives on which Democratic and Republican leaders were prepared to agree in 1959 -- statehood for Hawaii -- won overwhelming approval when the Senate, by a 76-15 vote, passed the enabling act. (See story, p. 22)

3. In a reenactment of the 1958 debate over a labor reform bill, the Senate acted on 55 amendments to the Kennedy bill. The only major change to win approval was an amendment by Sen. McClellan, embodying a "Bill of Rights" for union members, agreed to by a one-vote margin, 47-46. (See story, p. 18)

4. In a second key vote on the Kennedy bill, the Senate refused, 39-52, to add a provision putting an end to "no man's land" cases by turning over to the states jurisdiction in cases the NLRB refuses to handle. (See story, p. 18)

5. By a slightly closer margin the Senate also rejected, 41-50, a McClellan amendment to tighten the Taft-Hartley Act's ban on secondary boycotts -- a key objective of the President later achieved in the final labor bill. (See story, p. 18)

6. President Eisenhower's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, bitterly debated for several months by his Democratic detractors and Republican supporters, was finally rejected on a party-line vote, 46-49. (See story, p. 23)

7. A bold effort to grant the Development Loan Fund long-term borrowing authority was frustrated when the Senate refused, 42-48, to table a motion challenging the legality of the proposed financing arrangement. (See story, p. 12)

8. Rising Congressional criticism of the military assistance portion of the Mutual Security Program culminated in the Senate's decision, by a 52-41 vote, to cut \$300 million from the President's \$1.6 billion military aid request. (See story, p. 12)

9. Worried over the Army's capacity to fight a limited war, House and Senate Committees added \$400 million to the defense budget for modernizing Army equipment. But the Senate refused, 43-48, to add another \$234 million. (See story, p. 16)

10. The Senate Finance Committee cut by a substantial amount the benefits provided in a House bill revising veterans' pensions. But the Senate voted 75-20 to restore the more generous provisions of the House measure. (See story, p. 9)

11. For a month after the President vetoed the first housing bill, Democrats pondered the next step. When they finally decided to attempt to override, the effort fell nine votes short of a two-thirds majority -- 55-40. (See story, p. 6)

12. When the President vetoed a second housing bill not much different from the first, the Senate immediately put the issue to a vote. This time the 58-36 ballot to override fell five votes shy of the required number. (See story, p. 6)

13. Delay by the House in acting on the President's request to increase the Federal tax on gasoline by 1½ cents prompted Senate efforts to add the provision to another revenue bill. But the move was rejected by a 33-46 vote. (See story, p. 2)

14. When the House finally voted to override the President's second veto of the public works bill, the Senate quickly voted likewise, 72-23, handing the President his first such defeat during his seven years in office. (See story, p. 11)

15. A move to ease restrictions on granting aid to Poland and other Soviet-bloc satellites had been defeated in 1958 by one vote. But in 1959 the Senate voted 49-40 to pass a bill effecting the Administration-backed change. (See story, p. 12)

16. Southern Democrats precipitated the final debate of the session, over a measure to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for two years. When put to a vote, the Senate endorsed the extension by a resounding majority, 71-18. (See story p. 20)

Key Votes - 1

House Key Votes on Hawaii Statehood, TVA Bonds, Foreign Aid, States Rights, Labor Regulation

1. S 50. Passage of the Senate version of the Hawaii statehood bill. Passed 323-89 (D 203-65; R 120-24), March 12, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
2. HR 3460. Authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue up to \$750 million worth of revenue bonds to finance new power facilities. Passage of the bill. Passed 245-170 (D 238-31; R 7-139), May 7, 1959. The President did not take a position on passage of the bill.
3. HR 7500. Mutual Security Act of 1959 authorizing \$3,542,-600,000 in fiscal 1960 funds. Passed 271-142 (D 182-83; R 89-59), June 18, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
4. HR 3. A bill to permit Federal courts to strike down state laws under the Federal preemption doctrine only if Congress had specified its intention to preempt the field of legislation involved or if a state and a Federal law were in irreconcilable conflict, and to permit state enforcement of laws barring subversive activities against the Federal Government. Passage of the bill. Passed 225-192 (D 111-162; R 114-30), June 24, 1959. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
5. HR 8342. Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. Landrum (D Ga.) and Griffin (R Mich.) amendment to substitute for the committee bill the language of their bill, containing curbs on secondary boycotts and organizational and recognition picketing, and giving the states power to handle "no man's land" labor disputes. Agreed to 229-201 (D 95-184; R 134-17), Aug. 13, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
6. HR 8342. Passage of the bill. Passed 303-125 (D 156-122; R 147-3), Aug. 14, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL							DEMOCRATIC							REPUBLICAN						
Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yea	323	245	271	225	229	303	Yea	203	238	182	111	95	156	Yea	120	7	89	114	134	147
Nay	89	170	142	192	201	125	Nay	65	31	83	162	184	122	Nay	24	139	59	30	17	3

1 2 3 4 5 6						1 2 3 4 5 6						1 2 3 4 5 6						- KEY -											
ALABAMA						ALABAMA						ALABAMA						Y Record Vote For (yea). ✓ Paired For. ± Announced For, CQ Poll For. N Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. - Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.											
3 Andrews	N	Y	N	Y	Y	25 Kase	Y	Y	?	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y													
1 Boykin	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	17 King	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 2 3 4 5 6												
7 Elliott	N	Y	Y	Y	?	26 Roosevelt	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	IOWA												
2 Grant	N	Y	N	Y	Y	21 Hiestand	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Carter	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
9 Huddleston	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	22 Holt	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Coad	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
8 Jones	N	Y	Y	Y	N	18 Hosmer	Y	X	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
5 Rains	N	Y	Y	Y	N	16 Jackson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Wolf	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
4 Roberts	N	Y	Y	✓	Y	24 Lipscomb	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Gross	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
6 Selden	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	15 McDonough	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8 Hoeven	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
ALASKA						20 Smith	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7 Jensen	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
AL Rivers	Y	Y	Y	N	N	COLORADO						COLORADO						1 Schwengel	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y					
ARIZONA						4 Aspinall	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	KANSAS												
2 Udall	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 Johnson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Breeding	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
1 Rhodes	Y	N	N	Y	Y	1 Rogers	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 George	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
ARKANSAS						3 Chenoweth	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Hargis	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y					
5 Alford	N	Y	N	Y	Y	CONNECTICUT						CONNECTICUT						1 Avery	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y					
1 Gathings	N	Y	N	Y	Y	2 Bowles	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Rees	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
4 Harris	N	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Daddario	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Smith	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
2 Mills	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Gioimo	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	KENTUCKY												
6 Norrell	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Irwin	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Burke	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
3 Trimble	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	AL Kowalski	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Chelf	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y						
CALIFORNIA						5 Monagan	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Natcher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
7 Cohelan	Y	Y	✓	N	N	DELAWARE						DELAWARE						7 Perkins	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N					
14 Hagen	Y	Y	?	N	N	AL McDowell	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Spence	Y	Y	Y	✓	N	Y						
2 Johnson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	FLORIDA						FLORIDA						1 Stubblefield	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
11 McFall	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 Bennett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Watts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
1 Miller (C.W.)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4 Fascell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8 Siler	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y						
8 Miller (G.P.)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	7 Haley	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	LOUISIANA												
3 Moss	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5 Herlong	Y	N	✓	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Boggs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
29 Saund	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8 Matthews	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Brooks	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
5 Shelley	Y	Y	Y	N	N	6 Rogers	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 Hebert	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y	Y						
27 Sheppard	Y	Y	Y	N	N	3 Sikes	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8 McSweeney	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
12 Sisk	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Gramer	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
6 Baldwin	Y	Y	Y	N	N	GEORGIA						GEORGIA																	
10 Gubser	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	8 Blitch	N	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
4 Mailliard	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	10 Brown	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
13 Teague	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Davis	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
28 Utt	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	4 Flynt	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
30 Wilson	Y	N	✓	Y	Y	3 Forrester	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
9 Younger	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Landrum	X	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
Los Angeles County	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9 Mitchell	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
23 Doyle	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	2 Pilcher	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
19 Holifield	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Preston	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
						6 Vinson	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6	
6 Morrison	✓	Y	?	Y	N	Y	NEBRASKA	3 Brock	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Lennon	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	6 McMillan	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Passman	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Brock	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Scott	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	2 Riley	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Thompson	X	Y	N	Y	Y	?	4 McGinley	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 Whitener	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Rivers	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Willis	X	✓	?	Y	Y	Y	2 Cunningham	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	10 Jonas	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	SOUTH DAKOTA						
MAINE							1 Weaver	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NORTH DAKOTA							1 McGovern	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
2 Coffin	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	NEVADA								AL Burdick	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2 Berry	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
1 Oliver	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	AL Baring	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	AL Short	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	TENNESSEE						
3 McIntire	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NEW HAMPSHIRE								OHIO							6 Bass	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
MARYLAND							2 Bass	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Ashley	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	9 Davis	Y	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y
2 Brewster	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Merrow	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	11 Cook	Y	Y	Y	X	N	Y	8 Everett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Follon	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NEW JERSEY								20 Feighan	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	4 Evins	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Foley	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	?	11 Addonizio	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	18 Hays	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3 Frazier	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Friedel	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	14 Daniels	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	19 Kirwan	Y	✓	Y	N	N	N	5 Loser	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Garmatz	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	13 Gallagher	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	17 Levering	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	7 Murray	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
1 Johnson	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	10 Rodino	Y	✓	Y	N	N	N	N	10 Moeller	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	2 Baker	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Lankford	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	4 Thompson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	6 Vacancy							1 Reece	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MASSACHUSETTS							3 Auchincloss	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	21 Vanik	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	TEXAS						
2 Boland	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	1 Cabill	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	14 Ayres	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	3 Beckworth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Burke	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	6 Canfield	Y	N	?	?	?	?	?	13 Baumgart	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Brooks	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
4 Donohue	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	8 Dwyer	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	8 Bettis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	17 Burleson	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
7 Lane	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	5 Frelinghuysen	?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	22 Bolton	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	22 Casey	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
8 Macdonald	Y	N	Y	?	N	N	2 Glenn	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	16 Bow	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	7 Dowdy	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 McCormack	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	9 Osmer	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Brown	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	21 Fisher	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 O'Neill	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	12 Wallbauser	Y	N	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	12 Devine	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	13 Ikard	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Philbin	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	7 Widnall	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	15 Henderson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	20 Kilday	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Bates	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NEW MEXICO								2 Hess	N	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	15 Kilgore	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
1 Conte	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	AL Montoya	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	5 Latta	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	19 Mahon	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Curtis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	AL Morris	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 McCulloch	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	1 Patman	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Keith	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NEW YORK								23 Minsball	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	11 Poage	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Martin	✓	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	41 Dulski	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	3 Schenck	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Rayburn	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Rogers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	30 O'Brien	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	1 Scherer	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	18 Rogers	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
MICHIGAN							32 Stratton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	OKLAHOMA							16 Rutherford	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 O'Hara	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	27 Barry	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Albert	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Teague	Y	?	N	Y	Y	Y
12 Bennett	N	N	N	N	N	N	3 Becker	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Edmondson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	8 Thomas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Bentley	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Derosmian	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Jarman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9 Thompson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
18 Broomfield	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	26 Dooley	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	6 Morris	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	10 Thornberry	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Cederberg	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	33 Kilburn	N	N	Y	✓	Y	Y	Y	4 Steed	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	12 Wright	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Chamberlain	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	40 Miller	Y	N	Y	✓	Y	Y	Y	1 Belcher	Y	N	X	Y	Y	Y	14 Young	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Ford	✓	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	39 Ostertag	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	OREGON							5 Alger	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Griffin	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	42 Pillion	N	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Green	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	UTAH						
4 Hoffman	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	34 Pirnie	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4 Porter	Y	Y	Y	X	N	N	2 King	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Jobansen	N	X	N	Y	Y	Y	43 Goodell	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Ullman	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	1 Dixon	?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Knox	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	35 Rieblman	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 Norblad	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	VERMONT						
2 Meader	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	37 Robison	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PENNSYLVANIA							AL Meyer	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Detroit-Wayne County							28 St. George	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	25 Clark	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	VIRGINIA						
13 Diggs	Y	?	Y	N	?	N	36 Taber	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	21 Dent	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	4 Abbit	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 Dingell	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	31 Taylor	?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 Flood	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	1 Downing	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
17 Griffiths	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	1 Watmright	Y	N	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	30 Holland	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	3 Gary	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
16 Lesinski	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	38 Weis	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	28 Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2 Hardy	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1 Machrowicz	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	29 Wharton	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	26 Morgan	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	7 Harrison	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Rabaut	Y	Y	✓	X	N	N	New York City								10 Prokop	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	9 Jennings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MINNESOTA							8 Anfufo	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	19 Quigley	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	8 Smith	X	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8 Blatnik	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	24 Buckley	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	14 Rhodes	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	5 Tuck	X	N	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Karth	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	11 Celler	✓	✓	Y	N	N	N	Y	15 Walter	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	10 Broybill	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Marshall	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	7 Delaney	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	17 Bush	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Poff	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Wier	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	23 Dollinger	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	29 Corbett	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	WASHINGTON						
7 Andersen	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	19 Farstein	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	8 Curtin	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7 Magnuson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
1 Quie	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	22 Healey	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	9 Dague	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Horan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Judd	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Holtzman	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	12 Fenton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Mack	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Langen	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	10 Kelly	?	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	27 Fulton	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	4 May	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Nelsen	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	9 Keogh	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	23 Gavin	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 Pelly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSISSIPPI							13 Multer	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	24 Kearns	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Tollefson	Y	N	Y	?	N	Y
1 Abernethy	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	16 Powell	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	13 Lafore	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Westland	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	✓
6 Colmer	N	✓	N	Y	Y	Y	14 Rooney	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	7 Milliken	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	WEST VIRGINIA						
3 Smith	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	18 Santangelo	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	16 Mumma	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3 Bailey	Y	N	N	N	N	N
2 Whitten	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	20 Teller	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	22 Saylor	Y	N	N	N	N	X	4 Hechler	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
4 Williams	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	21 Zelenko	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	18 Simpson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5 Kee	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
5 Winstead	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	5 Bosch	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	20 Van Zandt	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	6 Slack	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSOURI							12 Dorn	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Philadelphia					</								

House Key Votes on REA and Public Works Vetoes, Housing Bill, Gas Tax, Interest Ceiling on Bonds

7. S 144. A bill to give the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration final authority to approve or disapprove REA loans and to vest the Administrator with all REA functions, which were transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass 280-146 (D 274-4; R 6-142), April 30, 1959 (284 "yeas" were required for passage). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
8. HR 7509. Fiscal 1960 Public Works appropriation bill, appropriating funds for 67 projects that were not in the President's budget. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass 274-138 (D 263-6; R 11-132), Sept. 2, 1959 (275 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
9. HR 9105. Revised fiscal 1960 Public Works appropriation bill, making an across-the-board cut of 2½ percent in the funds provided in a vetoed bill (HR 7509), but retaining 67 projects that were not in the President's budget. Passage of the bill

over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Passed 280-121 (D 260-5; R 20-116), Sept. 10, 1959 (268 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

10. S 2539. Housing Act of 1959 (revised bill). Passage of the bill. Passed 283-106 (D 229-29; R 54-77), Aug. 27, 1959. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
11. HR 8678. Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959, raising the Federal tax on gasoline from 3 cents to 4 cents per gallon through June 30, 1961. Passed 243-162 (D 138-127; R 105-35), Sept. 3, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
12. HR 9035. Permit an increase in the interest rate on Series E and H Government savings bonds. Simpson (R Pa.) motion to recommit the bill with instructions that it be amended to permit the issuance of long-term U.S. securities at rates of interest over 4.25 percent when the President determines it to be in the national interest. Rejected 134-255 (D 3-252; R 131-3), Sept. 4, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL							DEMOCRATIC							REPUBLICAN						
Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12	Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12	Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12
Yes	280	274	280	283	243	134	Yes	274	263	260	229	138	3	Yes	6	11	20	54	105	131
No	146	138	121	106	162	255	No	4	6	5	29	127	252	No	142	132	116	77	35	3

7 8 9 10 11 12

7 8 9 10 11 12

7 8 9 10 11 12

- KEY -

ALABAMA

3 Andrews	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1 Boykin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Elliott	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Grant	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Huddleston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Jones	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Rains	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Roberts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Selden	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

ALASKA

AL Rivers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---

ARIZONA

2 Udall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Rhodes	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

ARKANSAS

5 Alford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Gathings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Harris	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Mills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Norrell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Trimble	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

CALIFORNIA

7 Cohelan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 Hagen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Johnson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 McFall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Miller (C.W.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Miller (G.P.)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Moss	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
29 Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
5 Shelley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
27 Sheppard	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Sisk	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Baldwin	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
10 Gubser	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
4 Mailliard	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
13 Teague	N	N	N	X	Y	Y
28 Utt	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
30 Wilson	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
9 Younger	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Los Angeles County

23 Doyle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
19 Holifield	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X

25 Kasem	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
17 King	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
26 Roosevelt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
21 Hiestand	N	N	N	N	N	Y
22 Holt	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
18 Hosmer	N	N	N	N	N	Y
16 Jackson	N	N	N	N	X	Y
24 Lipscomb	N	N	N	N	N	Y
15 McDonough	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
20 Smith	N	N	N	N	N	Y

COLORADO

4 Aspinall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Johnson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Rogers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Chenoweth	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

CONNECTICUT

2 Bowles	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Daddario	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Giamo	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Irwin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
AL Kowalski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Managan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

DELAWARE

AL McDowell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

FLORIDA

2 Bennett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Fascell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Haley	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
5 Herlong	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Matthews	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Rogers	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Sikes	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X
1 Cramer	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

GEORGIA

8 Blitch	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
10 Brown	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Davis	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Flynt	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
3 Forrester	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Landrum	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
7 Mitchell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Pilcher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Preston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Vinson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

HAWAII

AL Inouye				Y	Y	Y	N	N
-----------	--	--	--	---	---	---	---	---

IDAHO

1 Post	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 Budge	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

ILLINOIS

25 Gray	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
21 Mack	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
24 Price	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
23 Shipley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
16 Allen	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
17 Arends	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
19 Chipperfield	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
14 Hoffman	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
15 Mason	N	Y	Y	N	X	Y	Y	Y
18 Michel	N	N	X	N	X	Y	Y	Y
20 Simpson	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
22 Springer	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Chicago-Cook County

12 Boyle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
1 Dawson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
5 Kluczynski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
7 Libonati	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Murphy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
6 O'Brien	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 O'Hara	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
11 Pucinski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
8 Rostenkowski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
9 Yates	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
13 Church	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Collier	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Derwinski	N	X	X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y

INDIANA

11 Barr	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Brademas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
8 Denton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
10 Harmon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
9 Hogan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
1 Madden	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
5 Roush	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
6 Wampler	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
4 Adair	N	N	N	X	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Bray	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Halleck	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Y Record Vote For (yes).

✓ Paired For.

‡ Announced For, CQ Poll For.

N Record Vote Against (nay).

X Paired Against.

- Announced Against, CQ Poll Against.

? Absent, General Pair, "Present," "D" do not announce or answer Poll.

7 8 9 10 11 12

IOWA

4 Carter	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y
6 Coad	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
5 Smith	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 Wolf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Gross	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
8 Hoeven	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
7 Jensen	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
1 Schwegel	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

KANSAS

5 Breeding	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 George	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Hargis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
1 Avery	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
4 Rees	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
6 Smith	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

KENTUCKY

3 Burke	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
4 Chelf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 Natcher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
7 Perkins	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
5 Spence	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
1 Stubblefield	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
6 Watts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
8 Siler	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y

LOUISIANA

2 Boggs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
4 Brooks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
1 Hebert	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
8 McSwain	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N

Democrats in this type; *Republicans in Italics*

7 8 9 10 11 12						7 8 9 10 11 12						7 8 9 10 11 12						7 8 9 10 11 12									
6 Morrison	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	NEBRASKA							7 Lennon	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	6 McMillan	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X
5 Passman	Y	Y	Y	X	N	N	3 Brock	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5 Scott	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 Riley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Thompson	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	?	4 McGinley	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	11 Whitenor	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Rivers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Willis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	2 Cunningham	N	N	N	N	N	Y	10 Jonas	N	N	N	N	N	Y	SOUTH DAKOTA						
MAINE							1 Weaver	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NORTH DAKOTA							1 McGovern	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
2 Coffin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NEVADA							AL Burdick	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	2 Berry	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
1 Oliver	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	AL Baring	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	AL Short	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	TENNESSEE						
3 McIntire	N	N	N	N	N	Y	NEW HAMPSHIRE							OHIO							6 Bass	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MARYLAND							2 Bass	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	9 Ashley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9 Davis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?
2 Brewster	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1 Merrow	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	11 Cook	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8 Everett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Fallon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NEW JERSEY							20 Feighan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	4 Evins	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
6 Foley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11 Addonizio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	18 Hays	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	3 Frazier	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Friedel	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	14 Daniels	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	19 Kirwan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	5 Loser	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Garmatz	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	13 Gallagher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	17 Levering	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	7 Murray	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
1 Johnson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	10 Rodino	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	10 Moeller	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	2 Baker	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
5 Lankford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	4 Thompson	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	N	6 Vacancy							1 Reece	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
MASSACHUSETTS							3 Auchincloss	N	N	N	N	N	Y	21 Vanik	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	TEXAS						
2 Boland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1 Cabill	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	14 Ayres	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Beckworth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
13 Burke	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8 Canfield	N	?	?	?	?	Y	13 Baumbart	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2 Brooks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Donohue	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	6 Dwyer	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	8 Betts	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	17 Burleson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Lane	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5 Frelinghuysen	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	22 Bolton	N	X	N	Y	Y	Y	22 Casey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Macdonald	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 Glenn	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	16 Bow	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Dowdy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 McCormack	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9 Osners	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	7 Brown	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	21 Fisher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 O'Neill	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	12 Wallhauser	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	12 Devine	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	13 Ikard	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Philbin	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	7 Widnall	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	15 Henderson	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	20 Kilday	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Bates	N	N	N	N	N	Y	NEW MEXICO							2 Hess	N	N	N	X	Y	Y	15 Kilgore	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Conte	N	N	N	N	N	Y	AL Montoya	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5 Latta	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	19 Mahon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
10 Curtis	N	N	N	N	N	Y	AL Morris	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4 McCulloch	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	1 Patman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
9 Keith	N	N	N	N	N	Y	NEW YORK							23 Minshall	N	N	X	N	Y	Y	11 Poage	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
14 Martin	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	41 Dulski	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	3 Schenck	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	4 Rayburn	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Rogers	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	30 O'Brien	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	?	1 Scherer	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	18 Rogers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MICHIGAN							32 Stratton	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	OKLAHOMA							16 Rutherford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 O'Hara	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	27 Barry	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	3 Albert	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	6 Teague	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
12 Bennett	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	3 Becker	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	2 Edmondson	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8 Thomas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Bentley	N	N	N	N	X	Y	2 Derounian	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	5 Jarman	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	9 Thompson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
18 Broomfield	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	26 Dooley	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	6 Morris	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	10 Thornberry	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
10 Cederberg	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	33 Kilburn	N	N	N	X	X	Y	4 Steed	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	12 Wright	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Chamberlain	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	40 Miller	N	N	N	N	X	Y	1 Belcher	?	N	N	N	N	Y	14 Young	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Ford	N	X	X	X	Y	Y	39 Ostertag	N	N	N	N	X	N	OREGON							5 Alger	N	N	N	N	N	Y
9 Griffin	N	N	N	N	N	Y	42 Pillion	N	N	N	N	X	N	3 Green	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	UTAH						
4 Hoffman	N	N	?	?	Y	Y	34 Pirnie	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	4 Porter	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 King	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
3 Jobansen	N	N	N	N	N	Y	43 Goodell	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	2 Ullman	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Dixon	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
11 Knox	N	N	N	N	N	Y	35 Riehlman	N	N	N	N	Y	?	1 Norblad	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	VERMONT						
2 Meader	N	N	N	N	N	Y	37 Robison	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	PENNSYLVANIA							AL Meyer	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Detroit-Wayne County							28 St. George	N	?	?	Y	Y	Y	25 Clark	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	VIRGINIA						
13 Diggs	Y	Y	?	Y	N	N	36 Taber	N	N	N	N	N	Y	21 Dent	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4 Abbutt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
15 Dingell	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	31 Taylor	N	N	N	X	X	Y	11 Flood	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Downing	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
17 Griffiths	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1 Wainwright	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	30 Holland	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	3 Gary	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
16 Lesinski	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X	38 Weis	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	28 Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2 Hardy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Machrowicz	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X	29 Wharton	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	26 Morgan	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	7 Harrison	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 Rabaut	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	New York City							10 Prokop	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	9 Jennings	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MINNESOTA							8 Anuso	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	19 Quigley	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8 Smith	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Blatnik	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	24 Buckley	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	14 Rhodes	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5 Tuck	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Karth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11 Celler	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	15 Walter	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	10 Brophy	N	N	?	Y	Y	Y
6 Marshall	Y	N	?	Y	?	?	7 Delaney	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	17 Bush	X	N	N	N	Y	Y	6 Poff	N	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Wier	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	23 Dollinger	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	29 Corbett	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	WASHINGTON						
7 Andersen	Y	N	N	?	Y	N	19 Farbstein	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8 Curtin	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	7 Magnuson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
1 Quie	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	22 Healey	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	9 Dague	N	N	N	?	?	Y	5 Horan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Judd	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	6 Holtzman	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	12 Fenton	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	3 Mack	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Langen	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	10 Kelly	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	27 Fulton	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	4 May	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Nelsen	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	9 Keogh	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	X	23 Gavin	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	1 Pelly	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
MISSISSIPPI							13 Multer	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	24 Kearns	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	6 Tollefson	N	N	?	Y	Y	Y
1 Abernethy	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	16 Powell	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	?	13 Lafore	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	2 Westland	X	X	X	Y	?	Y
6 Colmer	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	14 Rooney	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	7 Milliken	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	WEST VIRGINIA						
3 Smith	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	18 Santangelo	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	16 Mumma	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	3 Bailey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Whitten	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	20 Teller	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	X	22 Saylor	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	4 Hechler	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Key Votes - 5

Senate Key Votes on Rules, Statehood for Hawaii, Labor Regulation, Confirmation of Lewis Strauss

1. Senate rules. Johnson motion to table Anderson motion to consider adoption of rules for the Senate of the 86th Congress. The Anderson motion also provided for adoption of all 85th Congress rules except Rule 22 (on cloture) and called for immediate consideration of a revised Rule 22. Tabling motion agreed to 60-36 (D 40-22; R 20-14), Jan. 9, 1959. The President did not take a position on the motion.
2. S 50. Statehood for Hawaii. Passage of the bill. Passed 76-15 (D 46-14; R 30-1), March 11, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
3. S 1555. Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. McClellan (D Ark.) amendment to add to the bill a new section providing a "Bill of Rights," with criminal penalties, to protect union members against unfair actions by their unions. Agreed to 47-46 (D 15-44; R 32-2), April 22, 1959. The President did not take a position on the amendment.
4. S 1555. McClellan (D Ark.) amendment to permit state labor relations agencies or state courts to handle labor disputes the National Labor Relations Board declines to handle. Rejected 39-52 (D 16-43; R 23-9), April 23, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
5. S 1555. McClellan (D Ark.) amendment to revise the Taft-Hartley Act ban on secondary boycotts to prohibit unions from inducing or coercing an employer or employee, by any means, to stop doing business with another firm or handling its goods, and to extend the secondary boycott prohibitions to all unions. Rejected 41-50 (D 16-43; R 25-7), April 24, 1959. A "yea" was vote supporting the President's position.
6. Nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. Rejected 46-49 (D 15-47; R 31-2), June 19, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL							DEMOCRATIC							REPUBLICAN						
Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vote No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yea	60	76	47	39	41	46	Yea	40	46	15	16	16	15	Yea	20	30	32	23	25	31
Nay	36	15	46	52	50	49	Nay	22	14	44	43	43	47	Nay	14	1	2	9	7	2

1 2 3 4 5 6						1 2 3 4 5 6						1 2 3 4 5 6						- KEY -					
ALABAMA Hill Sparkman ALASKA Bartlett Gruening ARIZONA Hayden Goldwater ARKANSAS Fulbright McClellan CALIFORNIA Engle Kuchel COLORADO Carroll Allott CONNECTICUT Dodd Bush DELAWARE Frear Williams FLORIDA Holland Smathers GEORGIA Russell Talmadge IDAHO Church Duorsbak ILLINOIS Douglas Dirksen INDIANA Hartke Capehart						IOWA Hickenlooper Martin KANSAS Carlson Schoeppel KENTUCKY Cooper Morton LOUISIANA Ellender Long MAINE Muskie Smith MARYLAND Beall Butler MASSACHUSETTS Kennedy Saltonstall MICHIGAN Hart McNamara MINNESOTA Humphrey McCarthy MISSISSIPPI Eastland Stennis MISSOURI Hennings Symington MONTANA Mansfield Murray NEBRASKA Curtis Hruska						NEVADA Bible Cannon NEW HAMPSHIRE Bridges Cotton NEW JERSEY Williams Case NEW MEXICO Anderson Chavez NEW YORK Javits Keating NORTH CAROLINA Ervin Jordan NORTH DAKOTA Langer Young OHIO Lausche Young OKLAHOMA Kerr Monroney OREGON Morse Neuberger PENNSYLVANIA Clark Scott RHODE ISLAND Green Pastore SOUTH CAROLINA Johnston Thurmond						Y Record Vote For (yea). ✓ Paired For. ‡ Announced For, CQ Poll For. N Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. - Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.					
												1 2 3 4 5 6						SOUTH DAKOTA Case Mundt TENNESSEE Gore Kefauver TEXAS Johnson Yarborough UTAH Moss Bennett VERMONT Aiken Prouty VIRGINIA Byrd Robertson WASHINGTON Jackson Magnuson WEST VIRGINIA Byrd Randolph WISCONSIN Proxmire Wiley WYOMING McGee O'Mahoney					

Democrats in this type; Republicans in italics

Senate Key Votes on Foreign Aid, Defense Funds, Veterans' Pensions, President's Housing Vetoes

7. S 1451. Mutual Security Act of 1959. Aiken (R Vt.) motion to table Case (R S.D.) appeal from a ruling of the Presiding Officer that the Foreign Relations Committee's provision for financing the Development Loan Fund by Treasury borrowings of \$1 billion a year was permissible under Senate rules. Rejected 42-48 (D 35-24; R 7-24), July 1, 1959. The President did not take a position on the motion.
8. S 1451. Ellender amendment to reduce military assistance authorization to \$1.3 billion. Agreed to 52-41 (D 40-19; R 12-22), July 7, 1959. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
9. HR 7454. Fiscal 1960 Department of Defense appropriation bill, appropriating \$39,594,339,000. Modified Symington (D Mo.) amendment to increase from \$1,450,000,000 to \$1,683,900,000 Army procurement funds and designate \$453 million of the total for modernizing Army combat equipment. Rejected 43-48 (D 40-19; R 3-29), July 13, 1959. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
10. HR 7650. Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, modifying the pension programs for veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict, their widows and children. Kerr (D Okla.) amendment to delete several cuts made by the Senate Finance Committee and insert the more liberal House provisions. Agreed to 75-20 (D 55-8; R 20-12), Aug. 13, 1959. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
11. S 57. Housing Act of 1959. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass 55-40 (D 53-10; R 2-30), Aug. 13, 1959 (64 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.
12. S 2539. Housing Act of 1959 (revised bill). Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Failed to pass 58-36 (D 52-9; R 6-27), Sept. 4, 1959 (63 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL							DEMOCRATIC							REPUBLICAN						
Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12	Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12	Vote No.	7	8	9	10	11	12
Yea	42	52	43	75	55	58	Yea	35	40	40	55	53	52	Yea	7	12	3	20	2	6
Nay	48	41	48	20	40	36	Nay	24	19	19	8	10	9	Nay	24	22	29	12	30	27

7 8 9 10 11 12							7 8 9 10 11 12							7 8 9 10 11 12						
ALABAMA							INDIANA							NEBRASKA						
Hill	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Hartke	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Curtis	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Sparkman	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Capehart	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Hruska	N	Y	N	N	N	N
ALASKA							IOWA							NEVADA						
Bartlett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Hickenlooper	?	N	N	N	N	N	Bible	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gruening	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Martin	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Cannon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ARIZONA							KANSAS							NEW HAMPSHIRE						
Hayden	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Carlson	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Bridges	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Goldwater	N	Y	N	X	N	X	Schoeppel	N	Y	X	Y	N	N	Cotton	N	N	N	N	N	N
ARKANSAS							KENTUCKY							NEW JERSEY						
Fulbright	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Cooper	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Williams	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
McClellan	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Morton	N	N	N	N	N	N	Case	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
CALIFORNIA							LOUISIANA							NEW MEXICO						
Engle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ellender	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Anderson	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kuchel	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Long	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Chavez	X	Y	N	N	Y	Y
COLORADO							MAINE							NEW YORK						
Carroll	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Muskie	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Javits	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Allott	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Smith	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Keating	N	N	N	Y	N	N
CONNECTICUT							MARYLAND							NORTH CAROLINA						
Dodd	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Beall	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Ervin	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bush	X	N	N	N	N	N	Butler	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Jordan	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
DELAWARE							MASSACHUSETTS							NORTH DAKOTA						
Frear	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Kennedy	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	✓	Langer	N	Y	Y	?	✓	Y
Williams	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Saltonstall	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Young	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
FLORIDA							MICHIGAN							OHIO						
Holland	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Hart	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Lausche	N	N	N	N	N	N
Smathers	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	McNamara	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Young	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
GEORGIA							MINNESOTA							OKLAHOMA						
Russell	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Humphrey	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Kerr	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Talmadge	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	McCarthy	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Monroney	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HAWAII							MISSISSIPPI							OREGON						
Long					Y		Eastland	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Morse	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fong					N		Stennis	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Neuberger	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
IDAHO							MISSOURI							PENNSYLVANIA						
Church	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	✓	Hennings	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Clark	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Dworsbak	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Symington	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Scott	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
ILLINOIS							MONTANA							RHODE ISLAND						
Douglas	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Mansfield	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Green	✓	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Dirksen	N	N	N	N	X	N	Murray	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Pastore	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

Key Votes - 7

Senate Key Votes on Gas Tax, Public Works Veto, Aid to Satellites, Civil Rights Commission

13. HR 7523. Neuberger (D Ore.) amendment to increase by 1½ cents per gallon the Federal excise tax on motor fuels. Rejected 33-46 (D 12-40; R 21-6), June 25, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.
14. HR 9105. Revised fiscal 1960 Public Works appropriation bill. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (two-thirds majority required). Passed 72-23 (D 60-2; R 12-21), Sept. 10, 1959 (64 "yeas" were required to override the veto). A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

15. S 1697. Give the President authority to approve economic aid for Communist-dominated countries other than the Soviet Union or those in the Far East when important for national security. Passed 49-40 (D 33-23; R 16-17), Sept. 12, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

16. HR 8385. Appropriations for the Mutual Security Program and certain Federal agencies. Hayden (D Ariz.) amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission two years, to Nov. 8, 1961, and appropriate \$500,000 to it. Agreed to 71-18 (D 43-17; R 28-1), Sept. 14, 1959. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

TOTAL					DEMOCRATIC					REPUBLICAN				
Vote No.	13	14	15	16	Vote No.	13	14	15	16	Vote No.	13	14	15	16
Yea	33	72	49	71	Yea	12	60	33	43	Yea	21	12	16	28
Nay	46	23	40	18	Nay	40	2	23	17	Nay	6	21	17	1

13 14 15 16					13 14 15 16					13 14 15 16					Y Record Vote For (yea). ✓ Paired For. ‡ Announced For, CQ Poll For. N Record Vote Against (nay). X Paired Against. - Announced Against, CQ Poll Against. ? Absent, General Pair, "Present," Did not announce or answer Poll.					
																13 14 15 16				
ALABAMA					INDIANA					NEBRASKA					SOUTH CAROLINA					
Hill	Y	Y	Y	N	Hartke	N	✓	X	Y	Curtis	N	N	N	Y		Johnston	N	Y	N	N
Sparkman	N	Y	Y	N	Capehart	✓	Y	Y	Y	Hruska	N	N	N	Y	Thurmond	N	Y	N	N	
ALASKA					IOWA					NEVADA					SOUTH DAKOTA					
Bartlett	N	Y	N	Y	Hickenlooper	Y	Y	N	Y	Bible	N	Y	N	Y		Case	?	?	Y	Y
Gruening	X	Y	N	Y	Martin	Y	Y	N	?	Cannon	N	Y	N	Y	Mundt	N	Y	N	Y	
ARIZONA					KANSAS					NEW HAMPSHIRE					TENNESSEE					
Hayden	Y	Y	Y	Y	Carlson	?	N	Y	‡	Bridges	Y	X	N	Y		Gore	N	Y	Y	Y
Goldwater	N	N	X	‡	Schoeppel	N	Y	N	?	Cotton	Y	N	N	Y	Kefauver	N	Y	‡	Y	
ARKANSAS					KENTUCKY					NEW JERSEY					TEXAS					
Fulbright	N	Y	Y	N	Cooper	Y	Y	Y	Y	Williams	Y	Y	Y	Y		Johnson	N	Y	Y	Y
McClellan	N	Y	N	X	Morton	Y	Y	N	Y	Case	Y	N	Y	Y	Yarborough	N	Y	Y	Y	
CALIFORNIA					LOUISIANA					NEW MEXICO					UTAH					
Engle	N	Y	Y	Y	Ellender	N	Y	Y	N	Anderson	N	Y	N	Y		Moss	N	Y	Y	Y
Kuchel	Y	N	Y	Y	Long	N	Y	Y	N	Chavez	-	Y	Y	Y	Bennett	Y	Y	N	Y	‡
COLORADO					MAINE					NEW YORK					VERMONT					
Carroll	Y	Y	Y	Y	Muskie	?	Y	Y	Y	Javits	Y	N	Y	Y		Aiken	?	N	Y	Y
Allott	Y	Y	N	Y	Smith	?	Y	N	Y	Keating	Y	N	Y	Y	Prouty	?	N	Y	Y	
CONNECTICUT					MARYLAND					NORTH CAROLINA					VIRGINIA					
Dodd	N	Y	N	Y	Beall	Y	N	N	Y	Ervin	N	Y	N	N		Byrd	Y	N	N	N
Bush	Y	N	Y	Y	Butler	Y	N	N	Y	Jordan	N	Y	N	N	Robertson	N	Y	N	N	
DELAWARE					MASSACHUSETTS					NORTH DAKOTA					WASHINGTON					
Frear	N	Y	N	Y	Kennedy	Y	Y	✓	Y	Langer	Y	Y	N	Y		Jackson	N	Y	Y	Y
Williams	Y	N	N	Y	Saltonstall	Y	N	Y	Y	Young	N	Y	?	N	Magnuson	N	Y	Y	Y	
FLORIDA					MICHIGAN					OHIO					WEST VIRGINIA					
Holland	-	Y	N	N	Hart	N	Y	‡	Y	Lausche	Y	N	N	Y		Byrd	N	Y	N	Y
Smathers	Y	Y	Y	N	McNamara	-	Y	Y	Y	Young	N	Y	N	Y	Randolph	N	Y	Y	Y	
GEORGIA					MINNESOTA					OKLAHOMA					WISCONSIN					
Russell	N	Y	N	N	Humphrey	N	Y	Y	Y	Kerr	N	Y	N	‡		Proxmire	N	Y	Y	Y
Talmadge	N	Y	N	N	McCarthy	N	Y	Y	Y	Manrony	N	Y	Y	Y	Wiley	?	N	Y	Y	
HAWAII					MISSISSIPPI					OREGON					WYOMING					
Long	✓	Y	✓		Eastland	N	Y	N	N	Morse	-	Y	Y	Y		McGee	-	Y	Y	Y
Fong	Y	N	Y		Stennis	Y	Y	N	N	Neuberger	Y	Y	Y	Y	O'Mahoney	-	‡	‡	‡	
IDAHO					MISSOURI					PENNSYLVANIA										
Church	-	Y	Y	Y	Hennings	N	Y	‡	Y	Clark	Y	Y	✓	Y						
Duorsbak	?	Y	N	Y	Symington	Y	Y	‡	Y	Scott	Y	Y	Y	‡						
ILLINOIS					MONTANA					RHODE ISLAND										
Douglas	N	Y	Y	Y	Mansfield	N	Y	Y	Y	Green	-	Y	Y	Y						
Dirksen	Y	N	N	Y	Murray	-	Y	‡	‡	Pastore	N	Y	Y	Y						

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

INDEX

AGED	
Health insurance program	7
Housing bill provision	6
AGRICULTURE	
Hog price decline	10
Surplus commodities, disposal	10
Tobacco price supports, bill vetoed	10
Wheat program, bill vetoed	10
AIR FORCE, U.S.	
Appropriation, fiscal 1960	15, 16
Merger with Army proposed	15
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT	
Extension	8
AIRPORTS	
Construction program extended	8
ALASKA	
Oil and gas leases	11
ANDERSON, CLINTON P. (D N.M.)	
Senate debate rules	24
Strauss nomination	23
ANTITRUST LAWS	
Appropriations, fiscal 1960	3
AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	
ARMED SERVICES	
Draft law extended	16
ARMY, U.S.	
Appropriation, fiscal 1960	15, 16
Manpower strength	15
Merger with Air Force proposed	15
ASIA	
Mission to South Asia	14
ATOMIC ENERGY	
State safety regulations	22
ATOMIC RADIATION	
ATOMIC WEAPONS	
Data exchange with NATO allies	17
Tests, suspension	13, 17
BANKS, BANKING	
National banks, borrowing powers	21
Reserve requirements	21
BENSON, EZRA TAFT	10
BERLIN CRISIS	13
BONDS, U.S.	
FNMA mortgages, exchange for	4
Interest rate increase	5
BUDGET, NATIONAL	
"Backdoor spending" issue	12
Controversy over	2
BURKE, ADAM ARLEIGH A.	15
BUSINESS & INDUSTRY	
Foreign investments	14
Merger notification proposal	21
CABINET COMMITTEE ON PRICE STABILITY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH	5
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK	13
CASE, FRANCIS (R S.D.)	16
CELLER, EMANUEL (D N.Y.)	
Civil rights legislation	20
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS	
Water-diversion project	11
CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM	17
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION	20
CLARK, JOSEPH S. (D PA.)	4
COAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT COMM.	11
COMMERCE DEPARTMENT	
Strauss nomination	23
Transportation study	8
COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS	22
COMMISSION ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS	9
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS	20
COMMUNISM, COMMUNISTS	
Smith Act revision	21
COMMUNIST NATIONS	
Aid to	12
CONGRESS, 86th, FIRST SESSION	
Adjournment	1
Deaths	iv
Key votes	24-32
Leadership fights	iv
Nepotism controversy	iv
CONGRESS, 86th, SECOND SESSION	
Party alignment	iv
DEBT, NATIONAL	
Legal limit increased	4
DEFENSE DEPARTMENT	
Air defense plan	15
Appropriation, fiscal 1960	15-16
Information practices	23
DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND	12
DIRKSEN, EVERETT MCKINLEY (R ILL.)	iv
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Home rule	24

DOUGLAS, PAUL H. (D ILL.)	
Area redevelopment program	8
Price levels, study	5
Senate debate rules	24
DULLES, JOHN FOSTER	13
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS	
Joint committee study	5
Nixon committee report	5
EDUCATION	
Federally impacted areas, aid to	7
Grants to states	7
School milk program	10
Student loan program	7
EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT DWIGHT D.	
Airport program	8
Atomic radiation hazards	17
Atomic weapons data, exchange with NATO allies	16
Budget controversy	1, 2, 5
Congress, relations with	23, iv
Debt limit, increase	4
Defense Dept. funds	15, 16
Dulles illness, death	13
Farm price supports	10
Foreign aid program	12
Gasoline tax increase	2
Hawaii statehood	22
Housing bills vetoed	6
Inflation danger	5
Interest rate on govt. bonds	5
Merchant Marine Act revision	8
Public works bills vetoed	11
REA loan applications, bill vetoed	13
Russia, trip to	13
Tobacco price supports bill vetoed	10
TVA revenue bonds	5, 23
Vetoes	23, iv
Water pollution control	8
Wheat program, bill vetoed	10
ENGLER, CLAIR (D CALIF.)	15
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	
"Equal time" ruling	21
FEDERAL NATL. MORTGAGE ASSN.	
Mortgages, exchange for bonds	4
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
Cease and desist orders	21
FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS	
FILIBUSTER RULE	24
FLEMING, ARTHUR S.	7
FONG, HIRAM L. (R HAWAII)	22
FOOD STAMP PLAN	10
FOREIGN AID PROGRAM	
Authorization and appropriation	12
Information, Cong. requests	23
FOREIGN POLICY REVIEW	13
FOREIGN TRADE POLICY	14
FORAND, AIME J. (D R.I.)	7
FULBRIGHT, J. W. (R ARK.)	
Foreign aid program	12
Reid appointment	23
GASOLINE	
Tax increase	2
GENEVA FOREIGN MINISTERS CONFERENCE	13
GLENNAN, T. KEITH	17
GOLDWATER, BARRY (R ARIZ.)	18
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES	
Health insurance program	24
GRIFFIN, ROBERT P. (R MICH.)	19
HAWAII	
Statehood and elections	22, iv
HEALTH FOR PEACE PLAN	7
HEBERT, F. EDWARD (D LA.)	17
HERTER, CHRISTIAN A.	13
HIGHWAY ACT OF 1959	2
HILL, LISTER (D ALA.)	7
HOUSING ACT OF 1959	6
HUMPHREY, HUBERT H. (D MINN.)	
Youth Conservation Corps, proposal	7
IMMIGRATION	
Law revision	14
INDIA	
INOUE, DANIEL K. (D HAWAII)	22
INSURANCE COMPANIES, LIFE	
Tax formula	4
INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	14
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS ADVISORY COMMISSION	22
INTL. BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT	14
INTL. DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION	14
INTL. MONETARY FUND	14

JOHNSON, LYNDON B. (D TEXAS)	
Aftacks on	iv
Budget controversy	2
Civil rights legislation	20
Senate debate rules	24
JUDICIARY, FEDERAL	
Judgeships increase	24
JUSTICE DEPARTMENT	
Antitrust investigations	21
KENNEDY, JOHN F. (D MASS.)	18
KERR, ROBERT S. (D OKLA.)	
Veterans' benefits	9
Water resources	11
KEY VOTES	24-32
KHRUSHCHEV, NIKITA S.	13, 17
LABOR	
Minimum wage law changes	9
LABOR UNIONS	
Reform legislation	18-19
LAKE MICHIGAN	
Water-diversion project	11
LANDRUM, PHIL M. (D GA.)	19
LANGER, WILLIAM (R N.D.)	
Draft law extension	16
Strauss nomination	23
LATIN AMERICA	
Foreign aid to	12
LONG, OREN E. (D HAWAII)	22
LUCE, CLARE BOOTHE	23
MALLOY, R.	21
MARINE CORPS	
Manpower strength	15
MARTIN, JOSEPH W. JR. (R MASS.)	iv
McCARRAN-WALTER ACT	14
McCLELLAN, JOHN L. (D ARK.)	18
McELROY, NEIL H.	15
MEYER, WILLIAM H. (D VT.)	16
MINERAL POLICY	11
MISSILES	
Appropriation bill provisions	16
Controversy over	15
MORSE, WAYNE (D ORE.)	
Draft law extension	16
Law nomination	23
MUELLER, FREDERICK H.	23
MUNITIONS LOBBY	17
MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM	12
NATL. AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMIN.	
Appropriation, fiscal 1960	17
NATL. DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT	
Loyalty oath provision	7
NATL. INSTITUTES OF HEALTH	7
NAVY, U.S.	
Appropriation, fiscal 1960	15, 16
NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT RICHARD M.	
Price stability, report	5
Trip to Russia	13
OBSCENE MATERIALS	21
PASSPORT REGULATIONS	20
POLAND	
U.S. aid to	12
POLL TAX	
POWELL, ADAM CLAYTON JR. (D N.Y.)	19
PREFRENCE DOCTRINE	20
PRESIDENCY, U.S.	
Two term limit, repeal	24
PRICES	
Nixon committee report	5
PUBLIC LANDS	
Wilderness bill	11
PUBLIC WORKS	
Congress overrides second veto	11
QUINN, GOV. WILLIAM F. (R HAWAII)	22
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS	9
RAILROADS	
Commuter service	8
Freight car rental charges	8
REID, OGDEN R.	23
RENEGOTIATION ACT	21
REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949	21
ROBERTSON, A. WILLIS (D VA.)	6
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION	
Loan applications, bill vetoed	10

SCHOOLS
See Education

SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT	
Imports from Soviet Union	7
SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT	23
SECURITY PROGRAM	21
SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT	
Extension	16
SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS RETIREMENT ACT	
House passes bill	4
SENATE	
Filibuster rule, revision	24
SEWAGE TREATMENTS PLANTS	8
SHELLEY, JOHN F. (D CALIF.)	19
SHIPS, SHIPPING	
Subsidies	8
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	
Loan authority increased	8
SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT	
Revision approved by House	8
SMITH, MARGARET CHASE (R MAINE)	23
SMITH ACT	21
SPACE EXPLORATION	17
SPORTS	
Antitrust law coverage	21
STATES	
Federal vs. state responsibility	22
Preemption doctrine	20
Taxes on interstate commerce	4
STEEL INDUSTRY	
Labor contract negotiations	5
STEWART, JUSTICE POTTER	23
STRAUSS, LEWIS L.	23
SUPREME COURT	
Controversial decisions	20
Stewart appointment	23
SYMINGTON, STUART (D MO.)	
Army procurement funds	16
Missile controversy	15
TAFT-HARTLEY ACT	18
TAXES	
Corporate, excise tax rates	3
Highway bill provisions	2
Life insurance cos., formula	4
Retirement funds of self employed	4
State taxes on interstate commerce	4
TAYLOR, GEN. MAXWELL D.	15
TELEVISION	
Educational TV grants	7
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	
Controversy over authority to change construction program	23
Revenue bonds, sale authorization	5
THURMOND, STROM (D S.C.)	22
TOBACCO	
Price supports bill vetoed	10
TRANSPORTATION	
Commerce Dept. study	8
TWINING, GEN. NATHAN F.	15
UNEMPLOYMENT	
Area redevelopment plan	8
Study group established	9
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM	
Benefits, payment period extended	9
Improvements, proposals for	9
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	
Moon rocket	17
Scientific equipment	7
URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM	6
VETERANS	
Benefits to needy vets. with non-service connected disabilities	9
Housing loans	9
Readjustment benefits	9
WAGES	
Minimum wage law changes	9
WATER RESOURCES	
Pollution control	8
Senate committee established	11
WHEAT PROGRAM	
Eisenhower vetoes bill	10
WHITE, GEN. THOMAS D.	15
WILDERNESS BILL	11
WORLD REFUGEE YEAR	14
YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS	
Humphrey proposal for	7

For full background and detail,
see the CQ Weekly Report and
CQ Almanac in your library.



Around the Capitol In 1959

Leadership Fight Congress started off 1959 with leadership fights among Republicans in both the Senate and House. Senate Republicans battled over who should succeed William F. Knowland (Calif.), who retired to make an unsuccessful race for governor of California. They finally picked silver-tongued Everett McKinley Dirksen (Ill.). In a more bitter contest, rebellious House Republicans unseated Minority Leader Joseph W. Martin Jr. (Mass.) This broke up what many Republicans felt was a too cozy relationship between Martin and his Democratic counterpart, Speaker Sam Rayburn (Texas).

Attacks on Johnson

While Republicans in both chambers were deciding on new leaders, Senate Majority Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) was mobilizing for a mild revision of Rule 22, the Senate's anti-filibuster rule. He won out decisively over Senate liberals in the Rule 22 fight and showed promise of riding high as a leader for the rest of the session. But on Feb. 23 Sen. William Proxmire (D Wis.) attacked Johnson's leadership, declaring that Johnson gave the typical Democratic Senator "literally nothing to do with determining the legislative program and policies of the party." This first public attack on Johnson delivered in the Senate was followed by others by Democrats Wayne Morse (Ore.), Pat McNamara (Mich.) and Joseph S. Clark (Pa.).

The 'New' Ike

Leadership news spilled beyond the Capitol to the White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Here sat what many pundits called the "new" Eisenhower. Instead of striking his characteristically "hands-off" pose when it came to Congressional actions, the President developed a closer working relationship with Republican leaders on the Hill and brandished his veto weapon. As of Sept. 17 -- four days after Congress had adjourned -- President Eisenhower had vetoed 11 bills in 1959. This brought his veto total to 148 since he took office in 1953. In only one case -- the public works appropriation bill on Sept. 10 -- did Congress manage to override the President's veto in 1959. This was the first veto overridden in the Eisenhower Administration.

Longer Fuse

The stand-off between President Eisenhower and the Democratic Congress in many cases just put a longer fuse on explosive legislation. Cases in point are the housing, water pollution and airport construction bills. They are expected to be contested again next year.

Death Toll

Three deaths occurred in the House between opening day and adjournment of the first session of the 86th Congress. Representatives who died and the dates of their deaths: George H. Christopher (D Mo.), Jan. 23; Daniel A. Reed (R N.Y.), Feb. 19; James G. Polk (D Ohio), April 28. William J. Randall (D Mo.) was elected March 3 to replace Christopher. Charles E. Goodell Jr. (R N.Y.) was elected May 26 to replace Reed. No election has been scheduled in Polk's district.

Nepotism

A stampede of headlines galloped across the Nation's press as reporters dug into payroll files and found many Members of Congress with wives and other relatives on their staffs. The same investigation revealed that Rep. Randall S. Harmon (D Ind.) was charging the taxpayers \$100 a month rent for his back porch which he said he used as a district office. The scandal spawned several legislative proposals designed to stem the tide of public protest about nepotism. The Senate voted to make its payrolls public, but took no more drastic action.

Aloha Hawaii

Congress in 1959 sent Hawaii into a joyous hula by passing the legislation necessary to admit it to the Union as the 50th state. In its subsequent July 28 elections, Hawaii chose a Republican and Democratic Senator -- Hiram L. Fong (R), 51, and Oren E. Long (D), 70. To the House, Hawaii elected a Democrat, Daniel K. Inouye, 34. Fong is the first person of Asian ancestry to serve in the Senate and Inouye is the second Asian ever to serve in the House. The admission of Hawaii culminated a 40-year legislative effort by the former territory.

